REFERENCE LIBRARY OF
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
2 PARK STREET, BOSTON

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection

This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

AMOS:

AN ESSAY IN EXEGESIS.

BY

H. G. MITCHELL,

PROFESSOR IN BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

REVISED EDITION.

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
1900

COPYRIGHT, 1893 AND 1900,
BY H. G. MITCHELL.

PREFACE.

THIS book first appeared in 1893 as a private venture, with the imprint of Messrs. N. J. Bartlett & Co., of Boston. That edition having been exhausted, I seem warranted in hoping that, if regularly placed upon the market, my work will find even wider perusal and appreciation. Hence its reappearance under the present auspices.

It has not been necessary to make many or important changes. Of course, the typographical errors that I have been able to discover have been corrected. For the convenience of the majority of American students, I have adapted the references to Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar* to the *Second American Edition.* The new English edition is too expensive for general use. I have made but one important modification in the book. I formerly held and taught, that Joel and Obadiah preceded Amos. I now feel forced by the evidence in the case to assign them both to a much later period. I have therefore revised all my references to them from this standpoint. A few additional notes will be found in an Appendix at the end of the volume.

Those who wish to consult a complete bibliography of the subject of the prophecies of Amos will find one in Gunning's *Commentary*. I append a list of the more recent and important works to be consulted.

Oort, *De Profet Amos*, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, XIV. 1880.
Steiner, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1880.
Hoffmann, *Versuch zu Amos*, *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, III. 1883.
Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*, *ZAW*, III. 1883.
Gunning, *De Godspraken van Amos*, 1885.
Orelli, Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, 1888.
Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V. 1892.
Smith, G. A., *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, 1896.
Driver, *Joel and Amos*, in the *Cambridge Bible*, 1897.
Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1897.
Hartung, *Der Prophet Amos*, 1898.

H. G. M.

Boston University, January, 1900.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTORY STUDIES:

Amos of Tekoa 1

The Date of Amos 12

The Book of Amos 22

Appendix. — Analytical Table 33

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTS:

Translation 36

Comments 49

SUPPLEMENTARY STUDIES:

Amos and the Hexateuch 176

The Theology of Amos 185

Amos among the Prophets 199

INTRODUCTORY STUDIES.

I.

AMOS OF TEKOA.

On a high hill about six miles south of Bethlehem, and twice as far from Jerusalem, lies a mass of ruins of which the Arabic name is Tekua. They are the remains of Tekoa, the home of the prophet Amos.

The site is plainly visible from Bethlehem, whence Jerome[1] says that he used to see it daily; but it is difficult of access and consequently seldom visited by travelers. It is most easily reached from Bethlehem. The path, which is plain enough, but in many places very rough and stony, leaving Jebel Ferdis, or the Frank mountain, where Herod the Great loved to live and finally chose to lie, on the left, brings one in about an hour to wady Khureitun. At this point it is joined by another, and a worse one, from Artas and the Pools of Solomon, and from this point, by descending the wady, the labyrinth which has been wrongly identified with the cave of Adullam (1 Sam. xxii. 1) can be reached in a few minutes. Crossing the wady, the pilgrim to Tekoa ascends a tributary gorge, sometimes following the stony bed at the bottom of it, and some-

[1] See his introduction to the book of Amos.

times riding along a narrow, slippery ledge at its side, on which even a Syrian horse can hardly find a footing. After half an hour the path, which has hitherto maintained a southerly direction, suddenly turns eastward, and at the end of another half-hour it emerges into a hollow at the foot of the hill on which Tekoa was situated.

The view from the top of the hill is one of the finest in Palestine. Toward the north and the south the ground slopes off into wadys that open into the Dead Sea. Northward, beyond wady Khureitun, rises the symmetrical cone of Jebel Ferdis. Beyond it is Bethlehem. The Mount of Olives also is visible, but Jerusalem is hidden by intervening hills. Toward the east, in the foreground, are the naked, conical mountains of "the desert of Tekoa"; beyond them, about twelve miles distant, and more than four thousand feet below them, glistening like molten silver, lie the waters of the Sea of Salt; while in the background, suffused with a purple light that makes their ragged masses beautiful, the mountains of Moab rise against the eastern sky. The outlook westward is not so grand, but it has a beauty of its own, especially in the foreground, where lies outspread a broad and shallow valley, whose green grain and brown fallow give a charming variety to the prospect.

Such are the surroundings of Tekua. The hill itself is covered with the ruins of the city and fortress by which it was once crowned. These ruins make a peculiar impression upon the traveler. They look more like the preparations for a city than the remains of one that has been destroyed. In fact, they have been so little

disturbed since the city was destroyed by the Turks in 1138 that it seems as if it would be possible, in a short time, to make them habitable. Were the place restored without the church, whose baptismal font[1] is the most interesting relic of its former importance, one could with little difficulty transport one's self into the eighth century before Christ, and imagine one's self contemporary with the prophet; for the hills have not changed, and the people of the region cannot be much unlike the former inhabitants.

From the hill one can see the black tents of the Arabs dotting the landscape. There is always a cluster of them under its brow, on the eastern side, near the cisterns which once supplied Tekoa with water. At these cisterns still gather picturesque groups of women, to fill their jars and exchange their simple gossip. In the fields toward the west, or on the surrounding slopes, the men are meanwhile plowing, or sowing, or watching their flocks: sheep, white or brown, or goats as varied in color as Jacob's motley flock, with now and then a stunted cow or tiny donkey among them. Sometimes one of these shepherds is seen against the sky, as he stands like a statue on a projecting rock, wrapped in his sheepskin jacket and armed with a stout club or a rusty musket, while the sheep or the goats graze about him. Sometimes one is heard whiling away the hours by playing upon a rude pipe, whose notes his flock seem to

[1] Robinson (*Researches*, I. 486) describes it as follows: "Near the middle of the site are the ruins of a Greek church; among which are several fragments of columns, and a baptismal font of rose-colored limestone verging into marble. The font is octagonal, five feet in diameter on the outside, four feet on the inside, and three feet nine inches deep."

enjoy as well as he. They are fine fellows, these shepherds, from a physical point of view, — tall and straight, with bright eyes, clearly cut features, and a bearing that betrays a consciousness of the strength bred in them by their free and simple life.

Amos must have looked much like one of these Arab shepherds. He, too, was brown and sturdy. He, too, was clad in sheepskin when he led his flocks to pasture. It was, perhaps, when he was enjoying the grandeur of the prospect from one of his native hills, or soothing his soul with such music as he could make, that the Spirit made him conscious of a higher destiny and forced him to leave his sheep to be a prophet of Jehovah.

This call did not find Amos unprepared, for his previous life, besides cultivating the strength and vigor of his physique, had developed certain internal qualities that fitted him for his new vocation. What these were may be gathered from even a superficial perusal of his book. A more thorough study of it impresses them upon the imagination until they become as distinct as the features of a well-remembered face.

The first element in the prophet's character which strikes the reader of his prophecies is, perhaps, its simplicity. This characteristic is, in fact, the key to the book, the one without which Amos would probably never have heard the call that he received. It appears in his evident hatred of all sorts of human grandeur. Notice how often he uses the word *palace*,[1] and how persistently he threatens such abodes with destruction. This characteristic appears also in his sympathy for

[1] i. 4, 7, 10, 12, 14; ii. 2, 5; iii. 9 bis, 10, 11, 21; viii. 3. See also iii. 15; v. 9, 11; vi. 11.

simple people. The words *lowly* and *needy* are almost as frequent as *palace*.[1] Finally he displays the simplicity of his character in his picture of the future of his people (ix. 11 ff.). It is the humble house of David that is to rule the Hebrews, and it is the simple products of a fertile soil that are to constitute the wealth of the nation. The simplicity of Amos must have been rooted in his nature, otherwise it would hardly have become so thoroughly characteristic; but it is easy to see that his circumstances must have greatly favored its development. Even if, as some suppose, he owned the flocks and groves that he tended, he was probably comparatively poor. A bit of bread and a few figs or olives constituted his simple fare, while his flocks furnished the materials of his homely garments. If he ever indulged himself in greater luxuries it was only on extraordinary occasions, such as a wedding in the neighborhood or a pilgrimage to the holy city. It is this, his mode of life, that explains the vehemence with which the shepherd of Tekoa denounces the voluptuous nobles of Samaria, and would have denounced them if they had not been as wicked as they were voluptuous.

Amos' simplicity was coupled with a fearlessness that is inspiring. Had he not been as fearless as he was simple he would not have obeyed the call of Jehovah and undertaken the mission to Israel, for there was reason to expect that it would prove a dangerous errand. The fact that he undertook it at all is, therefore, a proof of his fearlessness. There is another in the fact that he addressed himself to the wealthy and powerful in Israel, and, not content with condemning them in gen-

[1] ii. 6, 7 bis; iv. 1 bis; v. 11; viii. 4 bis, 6 bis.

eral terms, arraigned them for one after another of the sins of which they were guilty. It is only necessary to refer to ii. 7 f., vi. 3 ff., and viii. 4 ff. for excellent examples of the relentless directness of his method. Moreover, when Amasiah tried to silence him, he took the risk of a personal encounter with that dignitary. Tradition says that he remained at his post until, having been cruelly beaten, he was carried to his own country, where, after a few days, he died.[1] This may or may not be a correct account of the prophet's end, but there is no doubt that he had in him the stuff of a martyr. Nor is it surprising that he should have shown himself thus fearless. The life of an oriental shepherd tends to develop courage. He has not only to endure all sorts of weather, but sometimes even to encounter the most ferocious beasts, in the care and defense of his flock. Amos must have had such experiences. He, like David, had braved the lion and the bear, and thus prepared himself to meet the dangers to which his prophetic labors exposed him.

A combination of simplicity and fearlessness might have made Amos a successful agitator in Israel, but something additional was needed to make him a reliable teacher for his contemporaries, and give to his utterances a value for all generations. This additional characteristic was discernment, — power to see distinctions, —.a power which Amos possessed to a degree not surpassed in the greatest of the Hebrew prophets. That he was thus gifted two or three references to his book will suffice to show. The kingdom of Israel was, at the time of his mission, enjoying remarkable prosperity.

[1] Pseudodorotheus in *Chron. paschale*, ed. Dindorf, I. 277.

Those who were most affected by this state of things seem to have supposed that it was a token of Jehovah's favor. Amos was not so easily deceived. He saw that, though the blessing of Jehovah made rich, it was not safe to maintain the converse of this proposition; that, in fact, the means by which the rich and great had acquired their share of this boasted prosperity were such as must, sooner or later, bring upon them the vengeance of their God.[1] The most remarkable passages in the book are remarkable for the discernment that they manifest. Such are the passages dealing with the forms of religion,[2] for which there was no lack of zeal in Israel, and those touching the covenant[3] in which they trusted. So clearly is the truth, with reference to these matters, perceived and stated that one wonders how those who heard the prophet could continue in their error. How did Amos acquire this power? It was partly, no doubt, an original endowment, and partly a supplementary bestowment, but there was another factor. Had he been born and bred in other circumstances than those by which he was actually surrounded, the natural clearness of his vision might have been dimmed, and even the clarifying influence of the divine spirit counteracted. At Tekoa, far enough from the world to escape its bewildering spell, but not too far to allow him to observe its activities, he had leisure to cultivate the gift that was in him, and bring it to the perfection that it finally attained.

These are the more noticeable characteristics of Amos as a man. It remains to notice one or two of his peculiarities as a writer.

[1] iii. 10 f.; v. 11; vi. 3, 8, 12 f. [2] iv. 4 f.; v. 21 ff. [3] iii. 2; ix. 7.

It used to be the fashion to disparage the style of Amos, as if no good thing could be expected to come from Tekoa. The fashion was set by Jerome,[1] who, applying to the prophet the words that Paul (2 Cor. xi. 6) uses of himself, said that he was "rude in speech but not in knowledge." Later commentators discovered several words[2] whose forms were supposed to betray a defective education. The truth is that Amos, being a shepherd, often used words and expressions suggested by his calling, and sometimes constructed a sentence in a way that would hardly have been approved by the scribes of Uzziah's court; but it is a libel to represent him as a bungler at authorship. Judged by any proper standard, he deserves to rank among the first of the sacred writers. He is always clear, and usually remarkably forcible, in presenting his ideas; sometimes he is so skillful that, but for the faults with which he is charged, one would hardly believe him identical with the shepherd of Tekoa.[3] These supposed faults are therefore comparatively insignificant as blemishes upon the style of Amos, but important as proofs of the authenticity of his book. If, now, due weight be given to the further consideration that the clearness, forcibleness, and skillfulness of the prophet's style probably depended upon his use of his own language in his own way, it will surely be granted that a better name for the so-called rudeness of Amos' style will be unconventionality or individuality.[4]

[1] See his introduction to Amos.

[2] מעיק ii. 13; בושסכם v. 10; מתאב vi. 8; מסרפו vi. 10; and ישחק vii. 16.

[3] See especially iv. 4 f., 12 f.; vi. 5 f.; ix. 1 ff.

[4] As for the words above cited, there is reason to believe that some at least of the irregularities in their orthography are chargeable to careless or ignorant copyists.

One of the most striking peculiarities of Amos as a writer is what may be termed his orderliness. This manifests itself in the structure of the book as a whole, but most clearly in its various divisions. The prophet's thoughts seem naturally to have arranged themselves in some sort of order. Sometimes it is their logical relation that is prominent, as, *e.g.*, in ii. 6–16 and iv. 4–13, but more frequently it is a series that attracts attention. The nations, *e.g.*, are arranged in order in the first two chapters. In the latter part of the second the sins of Israel and the proofs of Jehovah's goodness form two subordinate series. Other notable instances of the same habit of thought and expression are the series of illustrations in iii. 3 ff., of chastisements, iv. 6 ff., and of visions, vii. 1 ff. See also vi. 3 ff. and ix. 2 ff. These series, while not so long as to become tiresome, are long enough to impress upon the mind of the reader the truths that they are intended to illustrate, and justify the use of them by the prophet. It might be difficult to trace any connection between the orderliness that Amos displays in his book and his vocation, unless it be explained by the leisure enjoyed by the oriental shepherd. It is possible that most of the material of his prophecies had been, in a sense, prepared while he was tending his flock, little thinking what would become of his reflections, and that to this fact is due the orderly form in which they are presented.

There is one respect in which the style of Amos was greatly influenced by his calling. He would not have presented his thoughts so picturesquely as he did had he not had such opportunities for communion with

nature as this calling permitted. He knew the heavens and the earth in all their moods, the manifold forms of life that stirred about him, the perils and mischances of existence, and the dread phenomena by which his world was sometimes startled. His mind was so full of pictures from this source that, when he spoke or wrote, he involuntarily used them to illustrate his ideas on other matters. Hence his book abounds in such figures and illustrations. Notice the following tropes: Jehovah *roars* (i. 2), war is a *fire* (i. 3), wrath *rends* (i. 11), the Amorite is destroyed *fruit* and *root* (ii. 9), violence is *stored* (iii. 10), the women of Samaria are *kine of Bashan* (iv. 1), distress is *wormwood* (v. 7), *the Pleiades* and *Orion* represent creation (v. 8), violence *bursts* or *breaks* like light (v. 9), Israel takes *horns* (vi. 13), lack of the word of Jehovah is *famine* (viii. 11), *the plowman overtakes the reaper*, and *the mountains drop must*, in the good time coming (ix. 13), and the Hebrews are *planted* in their soil, never to be *uprooted* (ix. 15). The comparisons also are numerous: the Amorites are compared to *cedars* and *oaks* (ii. 9); the earthquake to a *wagon full of sheaves* (ii. 13); the remnant of Israel to *two legs and a bit of an ear* (iii. 12), and a *brand plucked from the flame* (iv. 11); the vengeance of Jehovah to an *unquenchable fire* (v. 6); the peril of Israel to that of one who escapes *a lion* and *a bear* to die by *a serpent* (v. 19); willing justice to *water* and *a living stream* (v. 24); the coming woe to *mourning for an only child* (viii. 10); and the captivity of Israel to *the shaking of grain in a sieve* that retains every good *kernel* (ix. 9). Add to these several virtual comparisons: the series of illustrations of the relation of cause and effect (iii. 2 ff.), and the two

of the madness of sin (vi. 12). Finally all the visions of the last three chapters were suggested by scenes and events of which the prophet must have been a witness. This is a long catalogue of illustrations for so short a book, — so long that it is not necessary to refer to those which cannot be traced to his experience as a shepherd to show that in picturesqueness, as in orderliness, Amos surpasses all the rest of the prophets.

Tekoa did much for Amos, but it is not necessary to claim that it alone made him all that he was. It has already been hinted that other influences wrought in his development. He was familiar with the history and condition of his own people. Where he learned what he knew about the Hebrews is, for the present, a matter of indifference. It is enough that, as must be admitted, he had, by some means, gotten possession of the great facts of their past and present, and studied them to some purpose. He had not confined his thoughts to his own country. He knew the neighboring nations; Syria, Phœnicia, Philistia, Edom, Moab and Ammon, with their history, and the remoter Egypt and Assyria. The last he does not mention by name, but he shows by his unmistakable references to it that he understood its general character, and appreciated, as few, if any, others did, its importance in western Asia. These mental excursions beyond the horizon of his native place must have helped to make him more than a shepherd before he became a prophet. Then Jehovah, by whose will his previous development had been directed, clothed him with the spirit, and his preparation was complete.

II.

THE DATE OF AMOS.

THE title to the book of Amos contains, among other things, two statements with reference to the date at which the prophet lived and labored. These statements are generally considered trustworthy even by those who deny that the title is from the hand of Amos. Taking for granted, for the present, that they are reliable, it would seem a very simple matter to fix, at least approximately, the date of the prophet. It ought only to be necessary to take the sum of the numbers which, according to the book of Kings, represent the duration of the reigns of the Judean kings from the first of Uzziah to the sixth of Hezekiah, and add this sum, minus one, to *722*, the date of the fall of Samaria, in order to get the earliest date at which Amos could have appeared; the latest could then be found by subtracting *27*, the number of years that Jeroboam II. reigned after Uzziah came to the throne, from this total. Now Uzziah is said to have reigned *52* years, Jotham 16, Ahaz 16, and Hezekiah 6, before Samaria was captured. The sum of these numbers is 90. The first of Uzziah was therefore $90-1+722$, or 811 B.C., and the last of Jeroboam II., $811-27$, or *784* B.C., between which two dates Amos must have prophesied in Israel.

The matter, however, is not so simple as it seems. In the first place, while 2 Kings xviii. 10 says that Samaria fell in the sixth year of Hezekiah, xvi. 1 of the same book requires one to believe that this event occurred in the thirteenth of Ahaz, at least three years

before Hezekiah came to the throne, and that, therefore, Uzziah did not begin to reign until 802 B.C. If, now, an attempt be made to arrive at the date of Amos by using the statements of the books of Kings with reference to the kings of Israel, the result will be found to agree with neither of those already obtained; for if Jeroboam II. (after Uzziah's accession) reigned 27 years, Zechariah $\frac{1}{2}$, Shallum $\frac{1}{12}$, Menahem 10, Pekahiah 2, Pekah 20, and Hoshea 9, and all together $68\frac{7}{12}$ years, Uzziah must have succeeded Amaziah in $69-1+722$, or 790 B.C. This calculation is based on the supposition that Uzziah began to reign in the fifteenth of Jeroboam II., as 2 Kings xiv. 23 would lead one to conclude. If, however, xv. 1, where Azariah, *i.e.* Uzziah, is said to have begun to reign in the twenty-seventh of Jeroboam II., be taken as a basis, the former must have ascended the throne twelve years later, or in 778 B.C. The last consideration also affects the lower limit in each of the first two calculations, so that the result is a *sixfold* one; *viz.* Amos may have prophesied between

811 and 784 or 796 B.C.
802 " 775 " 787 "
790 or 778 and 763 "

It is plain that only one of these results can be correct. As a matter of fact they are all incorrect. This can easily be proven by data from Assyrian history, whose correctness is unquestionable. Shalmaneser II. says that he took tribute of Jehu, king of Israel, in 842 B.C.; but if Uzziah began to reign in 811 or 802, this was clearly impossible, since the last year of Jehu was thus 811 or 802 plus the first 14 of Jeroboam II., the 16 of Jehoash, and the 17 of Jehoahaz, *i.e.* 858 or

849 B.C. It was possible if the first of Uzziah was 790 or 778, in either of which cases the last of Jehu was 837 B.C.; but if either of these dates be accepted as correct, it will be found in conflict with other Assyrian data. Thus, whether the first of Uzziah was 790 or 778 B.C., the last of Jeroboam II. was 763 B.C., and the last of Menahem 763, minus the one of Zechariah and Shallum and the 10 of Menahem, *i.e.* 752 B.C.; but Tiglath-pileser III., who did not begin his reign until 745 B.C., says that he took tribute of Menahem, and his statement is confirmed by the Hebrew historian; for the Pul of 2 Kings xv. 19 is no other than this Assyrian king. In this case, of course, if any earlier date for the beginning of Uzziah's reign be adopted, the discrepancy will only be the greater.

Are the chronological data of the books of Kings then worthless? This question has been too hastily answered in the affirmative. They are useless only in the hands of unskilled readers. To those who, by thorough study, have learned how to handle them, they are far from valueless. Indeed, most biblical scholars believe that they can be harmonized with one another and with data from profane sources and combined into a reliable system. This result, however, can only be attained by observing certain requirements which the data themselves, on close examination, suggest. In the first place, as is now generally admitted, one must discriminate between two classes of numbers, a more and a less reliable. The former consists of numbers which, like those for the duration of the reigns of the various kings of Judah and Israel, seem to have been derived from tradition or older documents; the latter, of those

which, like the relative dates of the rulers of the two kingdoms, are evidently the result of calculation. When numbers belonging to these two classes conflict, the latter must, of course, be rejected in favor of the former. Secondly, though too much has sometimes been made of co-regencies, there are cases in which the Bible itself furnishes authority for asserting them. Thus, *e.g.*, 2 Kings xiv. 17 says that Amasiah lived fifteen years after the death of his enemy Jehoash, but it does not say that he ruled over Judah at all after his defeat. Verse 21, indeed, indicates that he was thereupon virtually, if not formally, dethroned, in favor of his son Uzziah. Further, toward the end of Uzziah's reign, when he had been smitten with leprosy, Jotham was "over the house, judging the people of the land" (2 Kings xv. 5). In each of these cases the duration of the co-regency must have been reckoned as part of the reigns of two kings; hence, in part, the excess of the sum of the reigns of the kings of Judah from Amasiah to Ahaz over that of the reigns of the contemporary kings of Israel and over the actual duration of the period between these limits. The effect of a brief co-regency was produced by the practice of counting a last incomplete year of one king as the first of his successor. Thirdly, regard must be had to the synchronisms between Hebrew and Assyrian history.

The chronology of the kings of Judah and Israel has been much studied and discussed, and various schemes have been constructed. Only those are of consequence which have been constructed in accordance with the above requirements. They differ, but the differences among them are not serious. The following, for the

period between 843, when Jehu and Athaliah must have ascended their respective thrones, and 722 B.C., the date of the fall of Samaria, will be found as satisfactory, perhaps, as any: —

Judah.		Israel.	
1 Athaliah	=	1 Jehu	= 843 B.C.
6 "	} =	6 "	= 838 "
1 Joash			
23 "	=	28 "	= 816 "
		1 Jehoahaz	
39 "	=	17 "	= 800 "
		1 Jehoash	
40 "	} =	2 "	= 799 "
1 Amasiah			
14 "	} =	15 "	= 786 "
[1 Uzziah]			
15 Amasiah	} =	16 "	= 785 "
[2 Uzziah]		1 Jeroboam II.	
29 Amasiah	} =	15 "	= 771 "
16 Uzziah			
38 "	} =	37 "	= 749 "
[1 Jotham]			
42 Uzziah	} =	41 "	= 745 "
[5 Jotham]		Zechariah	
		Shallum	
		1 Menahem	
51 Uzziah	} =	10 "	= 736 "
[14 Jotham]		1 Pekahiah	
52 Uzziah	} =	2 "	= 735 "
15 Jotham		1 Pekah	
16 "	} =	2 "	= 734 "
1 Ahaz			
3 "	=	4 "	= 732 "
		1 Hoshea	
13 "			= 722 "

This scheme will bear examination. It preserves the relations between the kings of Judah and Israel,

described in the books of Kings. Athaliah of Judah remains the contemporary of Jehu of Israel; Joash of Jehu, Jehoahaz and Jehoash; Amasiah of Jehoash and Jeroboam II.; Uzziah of Jeroboam II., Zechariah, Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah and Pekah; Jotham of Pekah; and Ahaz of Pekah and Hoshea. Perhaps as many of the computed synchronisms as it would be possible to harmonize with any scheme find in this their justification. Moreover, the requirements of Assyrian chronology are met. Jehu begins his reign in time to pay tribute to Shalmaneser II. in 842 B.C., while Uzziah and Ahaz of Judah, and Menahem, Pekah and Hoshea of Israel are all contemporary with Tiglath-pileser III. Yet only one serious change has been made in the biblical data, — that in the length of Pekah's reign. This change was necessary in order that both Menahem and Hoshea might be brought within the eighteen years (745–727 B.C.) during which Tiglath-pileser ruled Assyria. It is also warranted on the ground that Pekah, or any one else, could hardly have maintained himself so long on the throne of Israel in the troubled period immediately preceding the overthrow of the kingdom.[1]

A glance at the above table will show within what limits the date of Amos must be found. He prophesied

[1] Tiglath-pileser III. in his annals claims to have put Pekah to death and set Hoshea upon the vacant throne (comp. 2 Kings xv. 30); and, from his account of the matter, it would at first sight seem as if this change of rulers took place in 734 B.C., during the Assyrian king's expedition to Philistia (Schrader, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* [*KAT*], 255 ff.; English, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, paged after the original in the margin). It is probable, however, that it occurred two years later, when Damascus was finally reduced by the Assyrian king. Compare Mürdter-Delitzsch, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 180.

while Uzziah ruled over Judah, and Jeroboam II. over Israel; but these two kings ruled contemporaneously, at the longest, from 785 to 745 B.C., and, strictly speaking, only from 771 to 745 B.C.; hence Amos must have appeared within one of these periods. He was probably not earlier than 771 B.C., for, at the time of his mission to Israel, Jeroboam II. had already fulfilled the prediction of Jonah of Gath-hepher (2 Kings xiv. 25), and restored his kingdom to its original dimensions, "from the entrance to Hamath to the stream of the Arabah" (Am. vi. 14); and until 773 B.C. Assyria was able to assert its sovereignty over Damascus and the surrounding country (Schrader, *KAT* 482). On the other hand, Amos' mission was not much later than the date above mentioned, for, not long after the death of his father, Uzziah began to display the wisdom and prowess by which he greatly enlarged and strengthened the kingdom of Judah (2 Kings xiv. 22), and there is no evidence that he had made much progress in his career when the book of Amos was written. Gath and Ashdod (2 Chron. xxvi. 6) were still unconquered (Am. vi. 2); in fact, the house of David was still so weak that it could fitly be represented as a mere "booth" (Am. ix. 11). Perhaps it will not be far wrong to conclude that 760 B.C. was about the date at which Amos appeared as the prophet of Jehovah at Bethel.

This conjecture is neither confirmed nor contradicted by the phrase *two years before the earthquake*, in the title to Amos' book, since it is now impossible to ascertain when the earthquake, which is also mentioned by Zechariah (xiv. 5), occurred. Josephus connects it with the attempt of Uzziah to usurp priestly functions

(2 Chron. xxvi. 16 ff.); but there are good reasons for denying any such connection. The first of these is that, while the earthquake, like the appearance of the prophet, was toward the beginning of Uzziah's reign, his encounter with the priests, and the stroke by which he was punished, practically closed his career. Further, Josephus' account of the matter is so evidently fictitious in those parts where its correctness can be tested that it is best to regard the whole as a product of his imagination.[1] The most, then, that can be learned from the phrase in question, if it is authentic, is so little that, for the present, it is not worth while to inquire whether or not it has any historical value. On this point see the comments.

Reference has already been made to the condition of Israel under Jeroboam II. This king, like his father Jehoash, had successfully defended his kingdom against his hereditary enemies, the Syrians, and even, it would seem (2 Kings xiv. 28), gotten possession of some of their territory. He and his soldiers doubtless enriched themselves at the expense of the conquered nation. Meanwhile his people, relieved from the destructive inroads of their Syrian and other neighbors, had suc-

[1] He says (*Ant.* IX. 10, 4): "In the meantime a great earthquake shook the ground, and a rent was made in the temple, and the bright rays of the sun shone through it and fell upon the king's face, insomuch that the leprosy seized upon him immediately. And before the city, at a place called Eroge (En Rogel), half the mountain broke off from the rest on the West, and rolled itself four furlongs, and stood still at the East mountain till the roads, as well as the King's Gardens, were spoiled by the obstruction." It is only necessary to turn to Zech. xiv. 4 f. to find that the historian borrowed from the prophet's description of a future convulsion most of the details with which he adorned the great event of Uzziah's reign.

ceeded in developing, to an extent not before attained, the resources of their own country. The wealth thus produced was not, it is true, equally distributed, but there was enough for all, and the fact that some had much more than their proportion only served to make the greatness of the aggregate more apparent. What wonder then if the king, as he saw the palaces of his nobles multiplying in Samaria, in spite of now and then a complaint from some less fortunate subject, allowed himself to be convinced that, as they doubtless assured him, his reign was a success, and the country, beyond precedent, prosperous?

This state of things, too, seemed likely to last, for no one could see whence evil was to be expected (ix. 10). The immediate neighbors of Israel had, one after another, been humbled. Judah seemed to be recovering, but Israel had nothing to fear from Judah and its inexperienced ruler. Even Egypt and Assyria, by which Palestine had, in the past, been repeatedly invaded, and between which both of the Hebrew kingdoms were destined to perish, seemed to have ceased to be dangerous. Egypt, no longer a compact nation under a vigorous monarch, had become a confused complex of little principalities, whose petty sovereigns were usually engaged in destroying one another. Once about this time they united against Pianchi, the king of Ethiopia, who had obtained a foothold in the country, but their union only made the task of overthrowing them the easier. They were all obliged to submit and pay tribute. When, therefore, Pianchi returned to his own country, he left them as discordant and as powerless against him, or any one else, as could be desired. As-

syria, also, was harmless. When Ramman-nirari III. closed his brilliant career in 783 B.C. the empire that he ruled extended from Lake Van on the north to the border of Elam on the south, and from Media on the east to the shore of the Mediterranean on the west (Schrader, *KAT* 212 ff.). His son, Shalmaneser III., beaten in a long struggle with Urartu (Ararat), lost his authority over many other provinces (Schrader, *KAT* 482). His grandson, Assurdan III., inherited the remnant of the empire in 772 B.C. During his first eight years he made seven expeditions in various directions, the first and the last into northern Syria. At the end of that time he found enough to busy him at home. In 763 B.C., the year of the eclipse, there arose an insurrection in the ancient capital, Assur. This lasted two years. By the time it was quelled there was another in Arpacha, which was followed by a third in Gozan. Moreover, in the year 759 B.C., when Gozan revolted, the plague, which had already once visited Assyria (765 B.C.) since Assurdan III. began to reign, returned. In 758 B.C. there was, in the words of the chronicler, "peace in the land"; but so exhausting had been the effect of these repeated calamities that the king did not again leave the country until his last year, 755 B.C. (*KAT* 482 ff.). His successor, Assur-nirari, barely maintained himself upon his throne until 745 B.C., when one of his generals, by the aid of the army, deposed him, and, under the name Tiglath-pileser III., founded the second empire (*KAT* 484 ff.). When, therefore, Amos appeared, Israel was at the height of its prosperity, while Assyria, by which he predicted that it and its neighbors would be destroyed, seemed to be approaching its fall; but Jeho-

vah had, for his own glory, chosen things that were base and despised, yea, and things that were not, to bring to nought things that were (1 Cor. i. 28).

III.

THE BOOK OF AMOS.

Amos has been characterized as the most orderly among the prophets whose writings are preserved in the Old Testament. It ought not, therefore, to be difficult to analyze his book. It is, in fact, a comparatively easy task. The divisions are usually well-marked, and their relation to one another apparent. Nevertheless, there is not perfect unanimity among scholars, even with reference to the general plan of the book. Some, like Bleek (*Einleitung*), divide it into two parts, i.–vi., and vii.–ix. Others prefer a threefold division, in which, however, they do not all agree. Thus, while most make the three parts i.–ii., iii.–vi., and vii.–ix., Ewald, for example, unites the first two into one, and finds his third part in the last nine verses of the last chapter, while Stade reckons ii. 6–16 to the second, instead of the first, part. Finally, Baur adopts a fourfold division, i.–ii., iii.–vi., vii.–ix. 10, ix. 11–15.

The points to be settled are whether there shall be a division at the end of the second chapter, and whether the promises, with which the book closes, shall form a separate part. As above stated, the former of these questions is oftenest answered in the affirmative, the latter in the negative; and this is really the only defen-

sible solution; for, while the first two chapters are complete in themselves, — the third chapter making a new beginning as clearly as does the seventh, — the last verses of the ninth are necessary to the completion of the doctrine of the rest of the chapter. Without them only one side of Jehovah's righteousness would have been presented. On the other hand, these last five (Baur), or, for that matter, nine (Ewald), verses are incomplete in themselves. Had Amos intended them to form a distinct part of his book, co-ordinate with i.–ii. and iii.–vi., he would have reproduced in them the ideas prominent in the book, and thus given them a more independent character. In view of the above considerations it seems best to adopt the threefold division, i.–ii., iii.–vi., and vii.–ix.

I. The first part serves as an introduction to the subject of which the book as a whole treats. It begins, after the title (i. 1), with a startling, yet indefinite, announcement (*v.* 2), later imitated by Joel (iv. 16), which must have had the effect of thunder from a clear sky. *Jehovah shall roar from Zion, and from Jerusalem utter his voice; and the pastures of the shepherds shall wilt, and the top of Carmel wither.* It is clear from this utterance that Amos is a prophet of wrath. He does not leave one long in suspense regarding those who are in danger.

The order in which the nations threatened are mentioned is very effective. First of all come the three utterly foreign nations, represented by Damascus (*vv.* 3–5), Gaza (*vv.* 6–8), and Tyre (*vv.* 9–10). Then follow three more nearly related to the Hebrews: Edom (*vv.* 11–12), Ammon (*vv.* 13–15), and Moab (ii. 1–3). Just before Israel comes Judah (*vv.* 4–5), next of kin to

the doomed people. When, therefore, Israel is finally mentioned (*vv.* 6–16), it is as if, while one was watching an approaching storm, it suddenly, having destroyed everything else, struck and shattered the very house over one's head.[1]

There is, in these first two chapters, an internal as well as an external climax. Not only does the danger constantly increase until the catastrophe is reached, but the fate of the last sufferer seems most dreadful and most richly deserved. This effect is produced, partly by introducing a new element, — the goodness of Jehovah, — and partly by dwelling on the case of Israel. Thus, instead of one, Amos lays four distinct transgressions to their charge (*vv.* 6–8). He also recites four proofs of Jehovah's goodness to them (*vv.* 9–12). Finally, he describes, with harrowing fulness, the penalty of their ingratitude (*vv.* 13–16).

II. The second part, consisting of chapters iii.–vi.,

[1] The section devoted to Judah is pronounced an interpolation by Duhm (*Theologie der Propheten*, 119) and others. The reasons given are that it is weak, unlike Amos, and very like one of the Deuteronomic authors. Its seeming weakness arises from its indefinite character. It was necessary, however, for the prophet to put the charge against Judah in this indefinite shape to avoid repetition when he came to Israel, since the two are condemned on practically the same ground, *viz.* for desertion of their God and disregard of his revealed will. In reply to the second point, let it be observed that the structure of the section as a whole is precisely like that of all the rest. The third point is also mistaken, for, as W. Robertson Smith (*Prophets of Israel*, 398) observes, and justly: *they have contemned the law of Jehovah and have not observed his statutes* is not necessarily a Deuteronomic expression. See, further, Supplementary Studies I.; also Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, II. 361. Wellhausen (*Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, V.) finds another interpolation, i. 11 f., which he denies to Amos on the ground that the hostility to Edom there displayed was unknown among the Hebrews before the Chaldean period.

inclusive, is a development of the threefold thought of ii. 6–16. It naturally falls into three divisions, each of which begins with the solemn injunction, *Hear ye this word.* The first division consists of chapter iii., the second of chapter iv., while the third includes chapters v. and vi. Each of these divisions may be more or less subdivided.

The first division is a sort of introduction to the other two. It opens with a brief repetition of the indictment against Israel, in which Judah also is included. This consists of two verses (1–2), the second of which may be regarded as the keynote of the book. *You only have I chosen of all the families of the earth: therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities.* Having thus stated his text, the prophet, before proceeding to amplify upon it, further prepares the way for his message proper. He accomplishes his object by two distinct means, hence the rest of the chapter falls into two sections, first, *vv.* 3–8, and second *vv.* 9–15.

The multiplied illustrations of the first section (*vv.* 3–8) at first confuse one, but there is never any doubt as to the prophet's meaning, and when the passage is carefully examined, it displays a degree of rhetorical skill that is surprising. Amos wishes to justify his sudden assumption of the prophetic office, and especially to add weight to what he feels moved to utter. He therefore claims that his appearance, like all other phenomena, is an illustration of the relation of cause and effect; that, in short, he is the messenger of an angry deity. His illustrations could not have been simpler, yet the effect is very impressive. One forgets the prophet in one's anxiety concerning his message.

The solemnity of the situation is increased by the appearance of the heathen as witnesses to Jehovah's justice in view of Israel's condition. The Philistines and the Egyptians are summoned and shown the corruption of Samaria (*vv.* 9–10). In their presence Jehovah declares his purpose with reference to Israel (*vv.* 11–12), and finally commands its proclamation to the condemned (*vv.* 13–15). There is something awful in the thought that the sins of the chosen people have reached such a degree of grossness that Jehovah can safely rely upon strangers to his grace to approve any penalty that he may decree.

Having thus presented his credentials, and vindicated in advance the justice of his master, Amos proceeds to the development of his theme.

The second division (iv.) is a vivid presentation of the desperate guilt of Israel. First (*vv.* 1–3) the women, whom he calls *kine of Bashan*, are arraigned for their cruelty and wantonness, and threatened with merciless captivity. Then follows a longer section (*vv.* 4–13), in which the nation as a whole is accused of obstinate hypocrisy in its relations with Jehovah. The first section is too brief to admit of many details, but the second is almost a perfect parallel to ii. 6–16 with its three subdivisions.

In the first of these sub-sections (*vv.* 4–5) the prophet exhorts his hearers to an increase of zeal in their religious observances; but the irony of his exhortation is apparent. It is really a warning that, being such as they are, they can only add to their offensiveness in the eyes of Jehovah by professing to be his worshipers.

They are blind to this fact, and their blindness is inexcusable, since Jehovah has given them repeated tokens of his displeasure. Amos rehearses (*vv.* 6–11) these unheeded chastisements. They are five in number. There are, therefore, in this second sub-section, five strophes, each of which ends with the plaintive refrain, *Yet ye returned not unto me, saith Jehovah.*

Therefore — This word introduces the concluding subdivision (*vv.* 12–13). Another and a more terrible description of the penalty to be inflicted would naturally follow, but it is for the present withheld. The prophet displays his literary skill in withholding it, and abruptly summoning Israel into the presence of the Almighty, with a description of whose power he closes the section and the division.[1]

The third and last division of the second part of the book (v.–vi.) contains the same elements as the one preceding, but the tone is, for the most part, entirely different. The effect is such as if Jehovah, dismayed by the terrors of his own anger, had suddenly resolved to make a last attempt to save Israel.

The change of tone is very marked in the first section

[1] The last verse of chapter iv. is also rejected by many critics, because, as is alleged, it is but loosely connected with the preceding, and because it teaches a doctrine that did not become prominent until the Exile. The first point is not well taken, for a description of the power of the Almighty follows naturally the summons into his presence, and the very abruptness of this description is one element of its power. On the second point it is only necessary to quote i. 2, iii. 6, iv. 6–11, vii. 1, 4, viii. 8 f., and ix. 13, to show that, to Amos, Jehovah was the Lord of the world, and vi. 12 and ix. 2–4 to prove that the order of thought is not unlike Amos. See on this passage also W. Robertson Smith, *PI* 398; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, II. 362. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) is inclined to consider *v.* 12 also as an addition to the text.

(v. 1–6). At the beginning of it the prophet breaks into a lament, as if the dreadful result suggested by the *therefore* of the preceding chapter had already been realized.

Fallen, not to rise again,
Is virgin Israel!
She is hurled upon her soil,
With none to raise her up!

This lament, the bitterness of which is explained by *v.* 3, naturally passes into an exhortation (*vv.* 4–6), in which a possibility of mercy is not merely suggested, but distinctly presented. To the exhortation is attached a warning that, unless Israel *seek Jehovah*, there is no way of escape for them.

The second section (*vv.* 7–17) is much longer and much more difficult of analysis. In this section the description of the power of Jehovah, with which Amos interrupts his characterization of the children of Israel, makes their danger so manifest that the prophet cannot refrain from renewing his exhortation; but he sees so plainly that it will remain unheeded that he himself seems to ignore it.[1]

The third section (*vv.* 18–27) recalls iv. 4–13, but it has a more serious tone than that passage. Its object is to expose the delusions by which the success of Amos'

[1] *Vv.* 8 f. are of the same character as iv. 13, except that, here, the description of the power of Jehovah interrupts the recital of Israel's transgressions instead of being attached to the sentence passed upon them. This, however, is but a variation in the order of thought, like vi. 12 ff. Moreover, the abruptness of the interruption is greatly relieved by regarding the definite participle with which *v.* 7 begins as a sort of vocative. See W. Robertson Smith, *PI* 398; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, II. 362. Compare Wellhausen, *SV*, V.

mission was prevented. He shows first (*vv.* 18–20) that the day of Jehovah should fill Israel with terror rather than expectation; then (*vv.* 21–27) that there is no virtue in purely ceremonial observances. In this latter subdivision occurs an exhortation (*v.* 24), but it is an exhortation only in form. The prophet expects nothing from it; he therefore proceeds to the decree with which the chapter closes. *Therefore take Sakkuth your king, even Kewan, your star-god, your images which ye have made for yourselves, and I will lead you captive beyond Damascus!*

The fourth and last section of this division (vi.) recalls iv. 1–3; for here, as there, luxury and misery are contrasted. This passage, however, though more general in its application, is much more abundant in details, and consequently more vivid and impressive than the other. The first section (*vv.* 1–7) describes the nobles, especially of Israel, — the first of the most favored of peoples, — as enjoying the first of all the luxuries of life, and promises them corresponding distinction when their country is overrun and conquered. The second section (8–14) pictures the depth of misery to which they must come in the madness of their resistance to the will of the Almighty.[1]

III. The break between the second and third parts of the book of Amos is so decided that it cannot be overlooked; for, although at the end of the sixth chapter the fate of Israel seemed sealed, at the beginning of the seventh the case is reopened. Moreover, the method

[1] Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) finds *vv.* 9 f. so difficult of interpretation that he drops them from the text, but they would seem to be a necessary enlargement upon *v.* 8.

of the prophet in the third part (vii.–ix.) is strikingly different from that hitherto employed. It is the visions of the last three chapters that distinguish them as compared with the rest of the book. There are five of them. The first three form a series illustrating a single truth; the other two are independent of them and of each other. This part, therefore, also falls into three divisions, each consisting of a separate chapter with subordinate divisions.

The truth taught in the first division (vii.) is that Jehovah, though merciful, will not always permit men to slight his mercy, but that, if they will not return to him, he will punish them as they deserve; that, in short, justice will avenge mercy.

The first section (*vv.* 1–9) contains the visions and a brief but forcible interpretation. Locusts were formed; they had all but destroyed vegetation when the prophet interceded and they were withdrawn. A visitation by fire was commanded; it had emptied the great deep, but just as it was about to devour the parched earth the prophet interceded, and it was quenched. Finally, the plumb-line appeared, and the prophet was powerless to delay any longer the divine vengeance (*vv.* 7–9). *I will not again pass him by*, said Jehovah.

The second section (*vv.* 10–17) contains a historical incident in which the prophecy of the preceding is personally applied. Amasiah, high priest at Bethel, following the example of those who before him had silenced the prophets and forced the nazirites to drink wine, first reports Amos to the king, and then attempts to drive him from the country (*vv.* 10–13). The prophet responds, vindicating his right to a hearing in Israel,

and foretelling that Amasiah himself will drink most deeply of the cup prepared for his people (*vv.* 14–17).

In the second division (viii.) it is the hopelessness of the case of Israel that is prominent.

This is illustrated by the vision of the basket of ripe fruit (*vv.* 1–3), which, at first sight, might seem merely a repetition of that of the plumb-line. On closer examination it will be found that while the plumb-line symbolizes the end of Jehovah's mercy, that of the ripe fruit symbolizes the end of Israel's nationality, the result of the divine indignation.

The second section is a development of this thought after the manner of parts II. and III. First the dishonesty of the greedy merchants of Israel is described in all its manifestations, and condemned (*vv.* 4–8); then the darkness and distress of the day of Jehovah is pictured (*vv.* 9–10); and finally the total abandonment of his apostate people by their God is predicted (*vv.* 11–14).[1]

That the children of Israel are doomed is the meaning of the first three visions. That their fate will be a sad one is the purport of the fourth. Is there no escape? This is the question with which the third and last division (ix.) deals, and so skillfully that the justice of Jehovah is completely vindicated.

In the first section (*vv.* 1–6) the vision and the interpretation given to it apply to those who, while they

[1] Oort (*TT*, 1880, 120), with Wellhausen (*SV*, V.), rejects *vv.* 11 f. as an interpolation, because they break the connection, and because they predict a dearth of prophets such as was not felt until after the Exile. In reply, it may be said that the question concerning the connection is one that is greatly affected by the interpretation adopted for the context, and that, as a matter of fact, but a single prophet, Oded (2 Chron. xxviii. 9), is mentioned as active in Israel in all the subsequent history.

know that the prophet's most terrible predictions are meant for them, flatter themselves that, whatever may happen to others, they will be able to protect themselves against even Jehovah. Them Amos charges to remember that it is an omnipresent and omnipotent God whom they have offended.[1]

"What, then," says one, "becomes of our covenant with Jehovah? Will he cast off his people?" Amos' reply to this implied objection (*vv.* 7–10) destroys the last refuge of hypocrisy, and entitles him to rank with the greatest of the prophets. The gist of this remarkable passage is that only those who fulfill their part of the covenant with Jehovah can expect to enjoy his favor. Not a grain of wheat will be lost, but the chaff must be given to the wind.

It must have greatly cheered the hearts of some who heard Amos, when he said, *Not a grain*, etc.; much more when this ray of assurance broadened into the splendid promise of the last section (*vv.* 11–15), the end of the book. Omnipotence pledges himself not only to rescue the good when the evil are destroyed, but to prepare for his saints a glorious future. The house of David, now humble, shall one day recover its former glory, and rule, not only Judah, but all the nations that ever acknowledged its divinely conferred authority.[2]

[1] If the genuineness of iv. 13 and v. 8 f. be admitted, that of *vv.* 5 f. of this chapter, which are evidently by the same hand, must be conceded. See W. Robertson Smith, *PI* 398; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, II. 362.

[2] The consideration above mentioned, *viz.* the necessity of presenting the reverse of Jehovah's justice, seems to outweigh any objections to the genuineness of *vv.* 8–15 that can well be urged. The opinion of Wellhausen (*SV*, V.), who holds that the mention of a return from captivity proves them to be later than the Exile, must therefore be rejected.

The beginning of the book was compared to the approach of a storm. Later in it the denunciations of the prophet seemed like thunderbolts from the midst of a tempest. When the clouds retreat, as they depart, the sun, bursting forth, paints upon their dark masses a rainbow, the symbol of God's mercy and faithfulness. Such a rainbow is the promise with which Amos comforts the faithful in Israel, after having predicted the destruction of the nation as such for their sins. The total effect, therefore, is to inspire a cheerful yet humble faith in a just and omnipotent God.

APPENDIX.

AN ANALYTICAL TABLE.

The result of the above analysis may be tabulated as follows: —

I. Approaching Judgment: i. 2–ii. 16.

1. Syria: i. 3–5.
2. Philistia: 6–8.
3. Phœnicia: 9–10.
4. Edom: 11–12.
5. Ammon: 13–15.
6. Moab: ii. 1–3.
7. Judah: 4–5.
8. Israel: 6–16.
   - *a.* Israel's Wickedness: 6–8.
   - *b.* Jehovah's Goodness: 9–12.
   - *c.* The Penalty of Ingratitude: 13–16.

- II. The Case of Israel: iii.–vi.
  - 1. Preliminaries of Justice: iii.
    - *a.* The Substance of the Indictment: 1–2.
    - *b.* The Prophet's Credentials: 3–8.
    - *c.* The Approval of the Heathen: 9–15.
      - Samaria's Corruption: 9–10.
      - Jehovah's Purpose: 11–12.
      - A Proclamation: 13–15.
  - 2. The Depth of Israel's Guilt: iv.
    - *a.* The Reckless Sensuality of the Women: 1–3.
    - *b.* The Obstinate Hypocrisy of the Nation: 4–13.
      - False Zeal: 4–5.
      - Unheeded Chastisements: 6–11.
      - Before Jehovah: 12–13.
  - 3. The Unwilling Severity of Jehovah: v.–vi.
    - *a.* A Possibility of Mercy: v. 1–6.
      - A Lament: 1–3.
      - An Exhortation: 4–6.
    - *b.* The Danger of Resistance: 7–17.
    - *c.* Some Perilous Delusions: 18–27.
      - The Day of Jehovah: 18–20.
      - Rites and Ceremonies: 21–27.
    - *d.* The Humiliation of Israel: vi.
      - The Height of Luxury: 1–7.
      - The Depth of Misery: 8–14.

- III. Israel's Fate Illustrated: vii.–ix.
  - 1. Justice the Avenger of Mercy: vii.
    - *a.* The Visions and their Interpretation: 1–9.
      - The Locusts: 1–3.
      - The Fire: 4–6.
      - The Plumb-line: 7–9.
    - *b.* Their Significance for Amasiah: 10–17.
      - Amasiah's Interference: 10–13.
      - Amos' Answer: 14–17.
  - 2. The Fruit of Sin the End of Israel: viii.
    - *a.* The Basket of Ripe Fruit: 1–3.
    - *b.* The Bitter End of Israel: 4–14.
      - A New Indictment: 4–8.
      - Distress and Darkness: 9–10.
      - Apostate, Abandoned: 11–14.
  - 3. The Destroyer of Sinners the Hope of his Saints: ix.
    - *a.* A Smitten Sanctuary: 1–6.
    - *b.* A Forfeited Distinction: 7–10.
    - *c.* A Purified Remnant: 11–15.

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE WORDS OF AMOS:

who was among the shepherds from Tekoa: what he beheld concerning Israel in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam, son of Joash, king of Israel, two years before the earthquake. (2) Said he:

I.

Jehovah shall roar from Zion,
Yea from Jerusalem utter his voice;
Then shall the pastures of the shepherds wilt,
And the top of Carmel wither.

1. (3) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Damascus hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because they threshed Gilead with iron-shod sledges; (4) but I will send fire into the house of Hazael and it shall devour the palaces of Ben-hadad. (5) I will also break the bar of Damascus, and cut off him who dwelleth therein from Bikath-awen, and him who holdeth the scepter from Beth-eden; and the people of Aram shall go captive to Kir, saith Jehovah.

2. (6) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Gaza hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: —

because they led completely captive to deliver to Edom; (7) but I will send fire within the wall of Gaza and it shall devour her palaces. (8) I will also cut off him who dwelleth therein from Ashdod and him who holdeth the scepter from Ashkelon; yea I will turn my hand against Ekron, and the remnant of the Philistines shall perish, saith the Lord Jehovah.

3. (9) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Tyre hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because they delivered a complete captivity to Edom and remembered not a brotherly covenant; (10) but I will send fire within the wall of Tyre and it shall devour her palaces.

4. (11) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Edom hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because he pursued his brother with the sword, stifling his pity, while his wrath ever rent and his fury he nursed without ceasing; (12) but I will send fire into Teman and it shall devour the palaces of Bosrah.

5. (13) Thus saith Jehovah: Because the children of Ammon have transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because they disemboweled the pregnant women of Gilead for the sake of enlarging their border; (14) but I will kindle fire within the wall of Rabbah and it shall devour her palaces, with clamor in a day of battle, with commotion in a day of tempest; (15) and their king shall go into captivity, he and his princes together, saith Jehovah.

6. (ii. 1) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Moab hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because he burned the bones of the king of Edom to lime; (2) but I will send fire into Moab and it shall

devour the palaces of Keriyyoth; and Moab shall die amid tumult, with clamor, with the sound of the trumpet; (3) yea I will cut off the judge from her midst, and all her princes will I slay with him, saith Jehovah.

7. (4) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Judah hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because they have contemned the law of Jehovah and have not observed his statutes: nay, the lies after which their fathers went have led them also astray; (5) but I will send fire into Judah and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem.

8. *a.* (6) Thus saith Jehovah: Because Israel hath transgressed three, yea four, times I will not revoke it: — because they sell for money the guiltless, and the needy for a pair of shoes. (7) Nay, they pant for dust of the earth upon the heads of the lowly and turn aside the way of the humble. A man also and his father go to the maid for the sake of profaning my holy name. (8) They even stretch themselves on garments taken in pledge beside every altar, and the wine of such as have been fined they drink in the houses of their gods.

b. (9) Yet it was I who destroyed before them the Amorite whose height was like the height of cedars, and his strength like *that of* the oaks; yea I destroyed his fruit above and his roots beneath. (10) I myself also brought you up from the land of Egypt, and led you in the desert forty years, to possess the land of the Amorite. (11) Moreover I ordained some of your children for prophets, and some of your youths for nazirites. Is not this indeed so, children of Israel? saith Jehovah. (12) But ye made the nazirites drink wine and the prophets ye charged, saying: Ye shall not prophesy.

c. (13) Lo, I will cause a trembling under you such as the cart that is full of sheaves causeth. (14) Then shall refuge fail the swift, and the strong shall not assert his strength, nor shall the mighty rescue himself. (15) Nay, he who handleth the bow shall not stand, nor shall the swift of foot rescue, nor he who rideth the horse deliver, himself; (16) but the stoutest of heart among the mighty shall flee naked in that day, saith Jehovah.

II.

1. *a.* (iii. 1) Hear this word that Jehovah hath spoken against you, children of Israel, — against the whole family that I brought up from the land of Egypt. (2) You only have I chosen of all the families of the earth, therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities.

b. (3) Do two walk together except they have joined each other? (4) Doth a lion roar in the wood when there is no prey for him? or doth a young lion utter his voice from his lair except he have caught something? (5) Doth a bird fall upon [a snare of] the ground if there be no springe for her? or doth a snare fly up from the ground and catch nothing at all? (6) If a trumpet be blown in a city, do not the people tremble? or if evil befall a city, is it not Jehovah who hath wrought it? (7) But the Lord Jehovah doeth naught except he have revealed his purpose to his servants the prophets. (8) A lion hath roared! who can but fear? The Lord Jehovah hath spoken! who can but prophesy?

c. (9) Proclaim ye over the palaces in Ashdod, and over the palaces in the land of Egypt, and say: Assemble yourselves upon the mountains of Samaria and see the manifold uproar therein, and oppression in her

midst. (10) Nay, they know not how to do right, saith Jehovah, but store up violence and oppression in their palaces.

(11) Therefore thus saith the Lord, Jehovah: A foe, even round about the land! and he shall strip thee of thy strength, and thy palaces shall be plundered. (12) Thus saith Jehovah: As the shepherd snatcheth from the mouth of the lion two legs or a bit of an ear, so shall the children of Israel be rescued, who sit in Samaria, in the corner of a couch and in the damask of a divan.

(13) Hear ye and declare unto the house of Jacob, saith the Lord Jehovah, the God of hosts, (14) that in the day when I punish Israel for his sins I will also visit the altars of Bethel, and the horns of the altar shall be broken off and fall to the ground. (15) I will also smite the winter-house together with the summer-house, and the houses of ivory shall perish, yea many houses shall disappear, saith Jehovah.

2. *a.* (iv. 1) Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan in the mountain of Samaria, who oppress the lowly, who crush the needy; who say to their lords: Fetch for us to drink! (2) The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by his holiness that, lo, days are coming upon you when ye shall be taken with hooks, yea, the last of you with fish-hooks. (3) Then shall ye go forth through the breaches, each one straight forward, and be driven toward Harmon (?), saith Jehovah.

b. (4) Come to Bethel and transgress! to Gilgal — add transgression to transgression! Nay, bring your sacrifices every morning, your tithes every three days, (5) and burn of leavened bread a thank-offering, and

proclaim freewill-offerings, make them known; for thus ye love to do, children of Israel! saith the Lord Jehovah.

(6) Yet it was I who gave you nothing to eat in all your cities and lack of bread in all your places: but ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah. (7) Moreover it was I who withheld from you the rain while yet there were three months until harvest; I also made it rain upon one city, while upon another city I did not make it rain; one field was rained upon, and the field whereupon I did not make it rain dried up; (8) and when *they of* two or three cities staggered to another city for water to drink, they were not satisfied: but ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah. (9) I smote you with blight and decay; your many gardens, and vineyards, and fig-trees, and olive-trees the locust devoured: but ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah. (10) I sent among you the pestilence, after the manner of Egypt; I slew with the sword your youths, with your captured horses, and I caused the stench of your camp to rise into your very noses: but ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah. (11) I overthrew some of you as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were like a brand snatched from the blaze: but ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah.

(12) Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel! — and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. (13) But lo, he who formeth mountains, and createth the wind, and telleth man what is his thought; who maketh dawn darkness and walketh on the heights of the earth — Jehovah, the God of hosts is his name!

3. *a.* (v. 1) Hear this word, a lament, which I uplift over you, house of Israel,

(2) Fallen, not to rise again,
Is virgin Israel;
She is hurled upon her soil,
With none to raise her up!

(3) For thus saith the Lord Jehovah: The city that goeth forth a thousand *strong* shall have *but* a hundred left, and the one that goeth forth a hundred *strong* shall have *but* ten left in the house of Israel.

(4) But thus saith Jehovah to the house of Israel: Seek me and live; (5) and seek not Bethel, nor go to Gilgal, nor cross to Beersheba; for Gilgal shall go into galling captivity and Bethel shall become *Beth*-Awen. (6) Seek Jehovah and live, lest he fall like fire upon the house of Joseph and it devour, and there be none to quench it for Bethel.

b. (7) Those who turn justice to wormwood and cast righteousness to the ground! — (8) He who maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth gloom into morning and darkeneth day into night; who calleth the waters of the sea and poureth them upon the face of the earth: Jehovah is his name! (9) Who causeth violence to burst upon the strong, yea, destruction shall come upon the stronghold! — (10) They hate in the gate one who reproveth, and one who speaketh uprightly they abhor. (11) Therefore, because ye trample upon the lowly and take a present of grain from him, though ye have built houses of hewn stone ye shall not dwell in them, though ye have planted pleasant vineyards ye shall not drink their wine. (12) For I know that your transgressions are many and your sins grievous: persecutors of the

guiltless! takers of bribes! yea, the needy they thrust aside in the gate! (13) Therefore he that is prudent will keep silence at such a time, for it is an evil time. (14) Seek good and not evil, that ye may live and that Jehovah, the God of hosts, may be with you as ye say. (15) Hate evil, and love good, and establish justice in the gate; perchance Jehovah, the God of hosts, will spare a remnant of Joseph. (16) Therefore, thus saith Jehovah, the God of hosts, the Lord: In all squares shall there be lamentation, and in all streets shall they say, Woe! woe! and they shall summon the husbandman to mourning and *require* lamentation of those who are skilled in wailing. (17) Yea, in all the vineyards there shall be lamentation, for I will pass through thy midst, saith Jehovah.

c. (18) Woe to those who wish for the day of Jehovah! Why, then, would ye the day of Jehovah? It is darkness and not light: (19) as if a man were fleeing from a lion, and a bear should meet him, and, when he came home and rested his hand against the wall, a serpent should bite him. (20) Is not the day of Jehovah darkness rather than light, yea, gloomy without any brightness?

(21) I hate, I despise, your feasts, and I take no delight in your festivals; (22) for when ye offer unto me burnt-offerings and your vegetable offerings, I am not pleased, and I regard not the peace-offering of your fatlings. (23) Away from me with the noise of thy songs, and let me not hear the sound of thy psalteries! — (24) But let justice roll as water and righteousness like a living stream! (25) Did ye bring me sacrifices and a vegetable offering in the desert forty years, house of Israel?

—(26) Nay, take Sakkuth, your king, even Kewan, your star-god, your images that ye have made for yourselves, (27) and I will lead you captive beyond Damascus, saith Jehovah, whose name is the God of hosts.

d. (vi. 1) Woe unto the careless in Zion, and the reckless in the mountain of Samaria, the noted of the first of the nations, to whom the house of Israel come! —(2) Go over to Kalneh and see, and go thence to Hamath the great, and go down to Gath of the Philistines. Are they fairer than these kingdoms? or is their border wider than your border? — (3) Those who postpone the evil day but bring near the seat of violence; (4) who lie on ivory couches, yea stretched upon their divans, and eat lambs from the flock and calves from the midst of the stall; (5) who twitter to the note of the psaltery, think that for them, as for David, are instruments of music! (6) who drink wine from basins and anoint themselves with the first of oils, but are not grieved on account of the affliction of Joseph. (7) Therefore shall they now go into captivity at the head of the captives and the shout of banqueters shall cease.

(8) The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by himself, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts: I abhor the glory of Jacob and his palaces I hate; yea I will give over the city and all that is in it. (9) And it shall come to pass that, if there be left ten men in one house, they shall die. (10) And when one's relative and burier shall take one to carry the bones forth from the house, and shall say to him who is in the inmost of the house: Is there yet any with thee? he shall say: None! Then shall he say: Hush! for one may not make mention of the name of Jehovah. (11) For lo, Jehovah will command, and

the great house shall be smitten to atoms and the small house to breaches. (12) Can horses run on the rock? or can one plow the sea with oxen? But ye have turned justice to gall and the fruit of righteousness to wormwood: (13) who rejoice in that which is not and say: Have we not in our strength taken to ourselves horns? (14) For lo, I will raise up against you, house of Israel, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts, a nation, and they shall oppress you from the entrance to Hamath unto the stream of the Arabah.

III.

1. *a.* (vii. 1) Thus the Lord Jehovah showed me: Lo, he formed locusts as the aftergrowth began to spring; and lo, it was the aftergrowth after the king's shearing. (2) Now it came to pass, when they would have wholly devoured the herbage of the land, that I said: Lord Jehovah, prithee forgive! How shall Jacob stand, since he is so small? (3) Jehovah repented him of this. It shall not be, said Jehovah.

(4) Thus the Lord Jehovah showed me: Lo, the Lord Jehovah called to punish by fire, and it devoured the great deep and would have devoured the field. (5) Then I said: Lord Jehovah, prithee cease! How shall Jacob stand, since he is so small? (6) Jehovah repented him of this. This also shall not be, said the Lord Jehovah.

(7) Thus he showed me: Lo, the Lord was standing by a plumb wall with a plumb-line in his hand. (8) Then said Jehovah to me: What seest thou, Amos? and I said: A plumb-line. Then said the Lord: Lo, I will place a plumb-line in the midst of my people Israel; I will not again pass him by. (9) But the high-places of

Isaac shall be laid waste, and the sanctuaries of Israel destroyed; and I will arise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword.

b. (10) Then Amasiah, the priest at Bethel, sent to Jeroboam, king of Israel, saying: Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel; the land is not able to contain all his words. (11) For thus saith Amos: By the sword shall Jeroboam die, and Israel shall surely go into captivity off their land. (12) Amasiah said also to Amos: Seer, go, flee thee to the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and there prophesy; (13) but at Bethel thou shalt no longer prophesy, for it is a sanctuary of the king and a royal residence.

(14) Then Amos answered and said to Amasiah: I am not a prophet, nor a son of the prophets, but I am a shepherd and a tender of sycamores; (15) but Jehovah took me from behind the flock, and Jehovah said to me: Go prophesy to my people Israel. (16) And now hear thou the word of Jehovah. Thou sayest: Thou shalt not prophesy against Israel, neither shalt thou preach against the house of Isaac. (17) Therefore, thus saith Jehovah: Thy wife shall play the harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be divided by line, and thou thyself shalt die on an unclean soil, and Israel shall surely go into captivity off their land.

2. *a.* (viii. 1) Thus the Lord Jehovah showed me: Lo, there was a basket of ripe fruit. (2) And he said: What seest thou, Amos? And I said: A basket of ripe fruit. Then said he to me: My people Israel are ripe for their end; I will not again pass them by. (3) But the songs of the palace shall become howls in that day,

saith the Lord Jehovah. Many shall be the corpses; everywhere shall they be cast. Hush!

b. (4) Hear this, ye who pant after the needy and to destroy the humble of the land, (5) saying: When will the new-moon be past, that we may sell grain, and the Sabbath, that we may open corn? diminishing the ephah, and enlarging the shekel, and providing false balances: —(6) buying the lowly for money, and the needy for a pair of shoes; — may even sell the refuse of the corn. (7) Jehovah hath sworn by the glory of Jacob: I will never forget all their deeds. (8) Shall not the land on this account tremble, and every one dwelling in it mourn? Yea, it shall rise like the Nile, all of it, [and heave] and fall like the Nile of Egypt.

(9) And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord Jehovah, that I will cause the sun to set at noon, and bring darkness upon the land in bright day; (10) and I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation; and I will bring upon all loins sackcloth, and upon all heads baldness. Yea, I will make it as mourning for an only child, and the end thereof as a bitter day.

(11) Lo, days are coming, saith Jehovah, when I will send famine into the land; not hunger for bread nor thirst for water, but to hear the word[s] of Jehovah; (12) and they shall stray from sea to sea, and from the north to the east shall they wander, seeking the word of Jehovah, but they shall not find it. (13) In that day shall the fairest maidens and the youths faint for thirst, (14) who swear by the sin of Samaria, and say: By thy god, O Dan! and: By the way of Beersheba! yea, they shall fall and not rise again.

3. *a.* (ix. 1) I saw the Lord standing by the altar; and he said: Smite the capital that the threshold quake, and break them upon the heads of all of them; and the last of them I will slay with the sword; there shall not a fugitive of them flee, nor shall a refugee among them escape. (2) If they burst into sheol, thence shall my hand fetch them; and if they climb into the heavens, thence will I bring them down; (3) if they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, there will I seek and thence will I fetch them; and if they cover themselves from my eyes at the bottom of the sea, there will I command the serpent to bite them; (4) and if they go into captivity before their enemies, there will I command that the sword slay them; yea, I will fix my eye upon them for evil and not for good. (5) But the Lord Jehovah of hosts, who toucheth the earth and it quaketh, and all who dwell in it mourn; yea, it riseth like the Nile, all of it, and falleth like the Nile of Egypt; (6) who buildeth in the heavens his chambers, and as for his vault, over the earth hath he fixed it; who calleth the waters of the sea and poureth them upon the face of the earth, — Jehovah is his name.

b. (7) Are ye not like the children of Kush unto me, children of Israel? saith Jehovah. If I brought Israel up from the land of Egypt, did I not also bring the Philistines from Caphtor, and Aram from Kir? (8) Lo, the eyes of the Lord Jehovah are against the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it off the face of the ground; only I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith Jehovah. (9) For lo, I will command and cause the house of Israel to be shaken among all nations as *grain* is shaken in a sieve, but there shall not a kernel

fall to the earth. (10) By the sword shall all the sinners among my people die, who say: Evil will not reach, will not befall us.

c. (11) In that day will I raise up the fallen hut of David, and wall up their breaches, and raise up his ruins, and rebuild it as in days of old; (12) in order that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations over which my name has been proclaimed, saith Jehovah, who doeth this. (13) Lo, days are coming, saith Jehovah, when the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and he who treadeth grapes him who soweth seed, and the mountains shall drop must, and all the hills flow therewith. (14) Then will I restore my captive people Israel, and they shall rebuild the waste cities and dwell in them, and plant vineyards and drink the wine from them, and make gardens and eat the fruit from them. (15) Yea, I will plant them upon their soil, and they shall not again be uprooted from their soil which I have given them, saith Jehovah, thy God.

COMMENTS.

THE TITLE (i. 1).

Each of the prophetic books is furnished with a title of some sort. Sometimes it is very brief, like that prefixed to the single chapter of which the book of Obadiah consists, and sometimes it takes several verses, as in the case of that of Jeremiah. In most cases it is a superscription proper without a predicate, but the books of Ezekiel, Jonah, Haggai, and Zechariah begin with a complete statement concerning at least the author.

The title to the book of Amos is a simple superscription in which, besides the name and origin of the author, and the date of his prophetic activity, the subject of his work is given. Some of these details have already been partially discussed, but it will be worth while to review them in their connection.

The words of: the book of Jeremiah is the only other that is described as *the words of* a prophet. In the titles to all the others the work is called *the word of Jehovah* (Eze. i. 3; Hos. i. 1; Joel i. 1; Jon. i. 1; Mic. i. 1; Zaph. i. 1; Hag. i. 1; Zech. i. 1); or *the vision of* a given prophet (Isa. i. 1; Oba. 1); or a *burden* whose subject is not always defined (Nah. i. 1; Hab. i. 1; Mal. i. 1). This peculiar expression would at first sight seem to warrant the reader in regarding the books thus described as purely human productions, but this mistake is prevented, in the case of Jeremiah, by the addition, in *v.* 2, of the relative clause, *to whom came the word of Jehovah*, etc., and in the case of Amos by the use of a verb in a following clause which refers the substance of the *words of Amos* to a higher source. — **Amos** (lit. Bearer,[1] comp. Amasiah, *Jehovah hath borne*, 2 Chron. xvii. 16) is not to be confounded with the father of Isaiah, whose name is the same in Greek[2] and might be spelled with the same letters in English, but is an entirely different word in Hebrew. Amos and Isaiah were doubtless closely related, but the tie between them was one, not of the flesh, but of the spirit. — **among the**

[1] Jewish interpreters say that the prophet was so named because he was "pressed with his tongue," *i.e.* slow of speech. *Waj. Rab.* x. 2.

[2] Hence the mistake of Clement of Alexandria and other early Greek authors.

shepherds: the word here rendered shepherd occurs only once elsewhere in the Old Testament (2 Kings iii. 4), where it must be understood in the sense of sheep-owner. Hence it is possible that Amos may have owned the sheep that he tended. Compare vii. 14.[1] The people of Tekoa were largely, perhaps almost wholly, engaged in rearing sheep, and Amos was one of their number. — **from Tekoa:** Tekoa was their home and the center *from* which they led their sheep into the surrounding pastures. It was in the tribe of Judah, and became the portion of Ashur, son of Hezron, of the family of Pharez (1 Chron. ii. 24; iv. 5). Thence came the wise woman whom Joab sent to David to plead for Absalom's recall from banishment (2 Sam. xiv. 2), and Ira, one of David's captains (2 Sam. xxiii. 26; 1 Chron. xi. 28; xxvii. 9). It was fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 6), and was thenceforward a rallying-point for the Jews in times of danger (2 Chron. xx. 20; Jer. vi. 1). It was re-occupied after the exile, and its inhabitants assisted in restoring Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 5, 27). It was a place of importance as late as the period of the crusades, but it is now only a heap of ruins.[2] — **what he saw:** the relative is rendered *what* instead of *which*, to indicate that the antecedent is not the *words* of Amos

[1] The Septuagint has ἐν Ἀκκαρείμ, which would correspond to אכרים, *husbandmen*, but whether the translators had a different text or merely misread that of the Masoretes is hard to determine. Vollers (*ZAW*, III. 262) suggests that the present Greek text is a corruption of ἐν Νακκαρείμ. Note also that, according to the Septuagint, it was not the prophet, but the words of the prophet, *which were in Akkareim*.

[2] This whole clause, *who . . . Tekoa*, is by some (*e.g.* Orelli) regarded as a later but reliable addition to the original title. Grätz (*Geschichte der Juden*, I. 403) identifies Tekoa with the Eltekeh of Josh. xix. 44, thus making Amos a Danite. See also Oort, *TT*, XIV. 122 ff.

but the *word* of Jehovah therein contained, of which alone it is proper to say that he *beheld* it in the sense of the verb here used; for this verb, which only rarely in poetry means *see* in the sense of *perceive*, is the proper word by which to describe the *insight* with which the prophets are represented as endowed. Thus, according to the title, the book of Isaiah is *The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he beheld*, etc. Ewald endeavors to do justice to this verb in the title to Amos by rendering the clause, *which he as a seer spake*. The words are the words of Amos, but the substance of his message is of divine origin and authority. See Jer. i. 1 f. — **concerning Israel,** *i.e.* Israel in the narrower sense, the northern kingdom (1 Kings xii. 16 ff.). Israel, in this sense, was the especial object of the mission of Amos, yet he by no means leaves Judah unnoticed (ii. 4; iii. 1; vi. 1 f.; ix. 11). Perhaps, however, some of these references to Judah were an afterthought added when the prophet came to put his words into permanent form. There are other indications that the book of Amos was not written until some time after the original prophecies were delivered. — **Uzziah:** also called Azariah (2 Kings xv. 1), the son of Amasiah, who reigned over Judah longest of all her kings. The events of his reign are described 2 Kings xiv. 21 f.; xv. 1 ff. and 2 Chron. xxvi. 1 ff. Later in his reign the prophets Hosea and Isaiah made their appearance (Isa. i. 1; Hos. i. 1). For a discussion of his date see the Introductory Studies II. — **Jeroboam:** the second of his name, the son of Jehoash, who, longer than any of the rest of the kings of Israel, maintained himself upon the throne, and, in the course of his reign, restored the kingdom to its original limits.

His reign is described 2 Kings xiv. 23 ff. For his date see the Introductory Studies II. — **two years before the earthquake:** for a discussion of the chronological value of these words see Introductory Studies II. There is room for doubt as to their authenticity. Of course, if Amos at once committed his prophecies to writing he could not have prefixed to them the present title; and if the title or any part of it is later than the rest of the book, especially if it is considerably later, any data contained in it may be mistaken.[1] On the other hand, it is possible that Amos delayed his book some time after his mission to Israel was fulfilled, and himself added to the title the note of time under discussion. In this case such allusions to earthquakes as iv. 11, viii. 8, ix. 5, and perhaps ii. 13, might be explained as details which did not belong to his original utterances. They certainly sound like reminiscences of the great "earthquake in the days of Uzziah." Compare Oort, *TT* 135 ff.

(2) **Said he,** lit. *and,* or *then, he* said, *i.e.* after he had seen the vision of the future with which Jehovah had honored him, he, Amos, made it known to those whom it concerned.

I.

APPROACHING JUDGMENT (i. 1–ii. 16).

The first part of the book opens with an abrupt proclamation whose terrors are only enhanced by its indefi-

[1] Hoffmann (*ZAW*, III. 87 ff., 122 f.) rejects אשר חזה and all that follows, explaining it as a later addition to the original title based on inferences from various passages in the book; *e.g.* iv. 11 and viii. 9, combined with vii. 8 and viii. 2. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) denies the above statements, and asserts that the title, though later than the rest of the book, must have been added by a contemporary of Amos.

niteness; and this is followed by an indictment against each of the surrounding nations and, finally, against Israel.

The first half of the tetrastich with which Amos begins his prophecies is, word for word, a repetition of the first half of Joel iv. 16. The order of the two books would suggest that Amos quoted from Joel, and there seems at first sight to be a confirmation of this suggestion in the fact that, while, in the book of Joel, these words are a part of a connected discourse, Amos makes them a sort of text, of which his book is the development (Meyrick). The divergence in the immediate context might be similarly interpreted, since Amos would be more likely to diverge from Joel than Joel from Amos. These indications, however, are found to be misleading, when one observes that Joel's conception of the effect produced is an exaggeration of that of Amos. This is proof that the former quoted from the latter, and not *vice versa*. For another variation on the prophet's words see Jer. xxv. 30. Compare Gunning. — **Jehovah shall roar:** Joel uses the word *roar* as a synonym for *thunder* (see Job xxxvii. 4), but Amos has in mind the comparison implied in the word, as is clear from iii. 8, where Jehovah appears under the name of the lion. — **from Zion:** Zion is here, as often (vi. 1; Isa. ii. 3), applied to the whole of the holy city. Its original application is disputed, but the latest researches tend to show that it was first of all the name of the hill now called Ophel, then of the whole ridge, on the northern summit of which the temple was built, and finally of the city of which this temple was the chief ornament. See Klaiber, *ZDPV*, III. 189 ff.; IV. 18 ff.; Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*

des Biblischen Alterthums. Compare Smith, *Bible Dictionary.* — **from Jerusalem:** Amos, though a Jew, nowhere lays stress on any peculiar relation between Jehovah and his own nation. It would not have been wise, in view of his object, to dwell on any such topic. Yet he now and then uses language which shows that he regarded Judah as enjoying such a relation. Here, *e.g.*, the capital of Judah is represented as the abode of Jehovah, and implicitly as the proper center of worship. In ii. 4 the Jews are described as the recipients, and therefore the custodians, of the law of Jehovah. If it be objected that the first of these passages is a quotation, and the second perhaps an interpolation, there remains ix. 11, in which it is the royal house of Judah through which the restoration of Israel is to be wrought. — **the pastures of the shepherds:** the uplands in southeastern Palestine on which Amos and his followers pastured their flocks. — **shall wilt:** as if the roar of Jehovah were accompanied by a desolating sirocco (Hos. xiii. 15). — **Carmel,** lit. *the Garden.*[1] There was a city Carmel, the home of Nabal (1 Sam. xxv. 5), not far from Tekoa, southward; the prophet, however, has in mind the mountain of this name on the coast of Palestine, west of the plain of Esdraelon. It is a ridge, rather than a peak like Tabor. It is more than twelve miles long from southeast to northwest, and about 1800 feet high toward the southeastern end where Elijah's altar was situated, but only about 500 feet high where it juts into the Mediterranean. Its beauty and fertility were proverbial among the Hebrews (Isa. xxxv. 2; Jer. l. 19;

[1] This name, like several others, usually has the article in Hebrew. See הגלעד *v.* 2; הבשן iv. 1, etc.

Cant. vii. 5). It seldom suffered with the surrounding country from drought or other causes; hence to picture it as withering at the voice of Jehovah was to predict an appalling visitation (Isa. xxxiii. 9; Nah. i. 4). For a description of the present condition of Mount Carmel and its inhabitants see Oliphant, *Haifa*, 82 ff.

The first of the nations to be called to account for its sins is

1. Syria, *vv.* 3–5,

represented by its capital, Damascus.

3. **Thus saith Jehovah,** or *Thus said Jehovah:* the decree has passed and the fate of the nation is sealed when the prophet delivers his message. This sŏlemn formula is prefixed to each of the sections devoted to the several peoples, and in all but three cases there is a similar formula at the end. The effect is to keep constantly before the mind that it is Jehovah, and not the prophet, by whom the nations are condemned. — **Damascus:** for that part of Aram or Syria of which it was the capital (2 Sam. viii. 6); a country whose extent varied at different times, but in the days of Amos must have been considerable, since it included Beth-eden on the east and the valley between the two ranges of Lebanon on the west (v. 5), though on the south it had probably lost the territory conquered from Israel (2 Kings viii. 28); for we are expressly told that Jehoash had retaken from Benhadad the cities which Hazael had taken from Jehoahaz (2 Kings xiii. 25), and further that Jeroboam II. restored the border of Israel from the entrance to Hamath to the sea of the Arabah (2 Kings xiv. 25). The relations between Syria and the neighboring nations were seldom pleasant. Between it and

Israel there had been almost constant war since the days of Baasha and Benhadad I. (1 Kings xv. 18). During this long feud there had been plenty of opportunities for cruelty on both sides, but the Syrians seem to have outdone their opponents and obtained a reputation for inhumanity. Because they were inhuman, not merely because they had practised their inhumanity on the chosen people, Amos, in the name of Jehovah, condemns them to destruction. — **three, yea four, times:** this idiom is used to denote an indefinite, or, as here, an unlimited number. The prophet does not mean that the Syrians have been guilty of just four sins, for the fourth, or all, of which they are now to be punished, but that they have repeatedly transgressed, and therefore deserve the penalty to be inflicted. Other examples of this use of various pairs of numbers are found Job xxxiii. 14; Prov. xxx. 15, 18; vi. 16; Eccl. xi. 2.[1] See Ges.[25] 134, 6 R. — **I will not revoke it:** this clause has been variously interpreted. The verb means literally *turn back.* Some (*e.g.*, Jerome) have taken it in the sense of *convert* and explained the pronoun as referring to Syria or its people. Most commentators, on the other hand, render the verb *reverse* or *revoke* and refer the pronoun to the utterance of *v.* 2 (Ewald), or to the penalty threatened *v.* 2 and described *vv.* 4 f. (Marck). It seems best to explain *it* as referring to a threat of an earlier date, whose fulfilment had been so long delayed that men began to disregard it and even ques-

[1] Jewish interpreters take the clause literally, and D. Kimchi undertakes to state the four sins which had exhausted the patience of Jehovah; *viz.* the three campaigns against Baasha, Ahab, and Jehoahaz of Israel, and the fourth against Ahaz of Judah (the last of which occurred twenty-five years after Amos' prophecy was uttered!). See also Jerome on the passage.

tion whether Jehovah really took note of their actions (vi. 1). It is this prophetic sentence of which Amos makes Jehovah say that he will not revoke it. Compare Isa. lv. 11.[1] — **because** introduces an instance, one of many that might be cited to justify the severity of the penalty threatened. — **they threshed Gilead:** Gilead, in a narrower sense, included the country east of the Jordan, between the Yarmuk on the north and the Arnon on the south (Deut. iii. 13); but in a broader sense it was sometimes applied to the entire region east of the Jordan claimed by the Israelites (Num. xxxii. 29). It is used in both senses 2 Kings x. 32 f., and it is that passage in which is recorded the event to which, in all probability, Amos here refers, — the invasion of Gilead by Hazael. It is worthy of notice that, 2 Kings xiii. 7, the historian, in describing the treatment of Israel by the Syrians, uses terms similar to those employed by Amos. "The king of Syria," he says, "had destroyed them, and made them like the dust in threshing." — **with iron-shod sledges:**[2] the machines here meant are still used in the East under nearly the same name. There are two forms, one of which has small rollers, while both are armed with bits of stone or iron. See Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, I. 150 ff. If, as is probably the case, Hazael is here accused of dragging these sledges over his captives, he was not the only conqueror of antiquity who practiced such cruelty (Prov. xx. 26). Even David, on at least one occasion, was

[1] Hoffmann proposes to point the verb אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ, and refer the suffix to Damascus; *i.e.* Syria.

[2] בחרצות הברזל for במרגי הברזל החרצים, the adjective חרוץ being used, as in Isa. xxviii. 27, for the noun to which it should strictly be attached. See Isa. xli. 15.

guilty of similar inhumanity (2 Sam. xii. 31). Hazael and his people, however, had transgressed *three, yea four, times* in this or other directions. Compare Pusey.

4. **I will send fire:** fire is a frequent figure for God's wrath or the agency through which it is manifested: see v. 6; vii. 4; Deut. xxxii. 22; especially war: see v. 14; ii. 2; Num. xxi. 28. It is, as appears from what follows, a devastating war with which Amos threatens Syria. Hosea (viii. 14) adopts the form of this refrain, and Jeremiah (xlix. 27) copies the verse with only slight modifications.[1] — **Hazael:** the usurper whose elevation to the throne was foretold by Elisha (2 Kings viii. 7 ff.), the contemporary of Joram (2 Kings viii. 29), Jehu (2 Kings x. 32), and Jehoahaz (2 Kings xiii. 22), kings of Israel, whom, one after another, he made his vassals. He must, therefore, have reigned until about 815 B.C. (comp. 2 Kings xiii. 22). He is here mentioned as the founder of the dynasty to which the king who ruled Syria when Amos prophesied belonged. — **Benhadad:** probably the son and successor of Hazael (2 Kings xiii. 24), the third of his name mentioned in the Old Testament. He was contemporary with Jehoash (2 Kings xiii. 25). It is not impossible that he outlived this king of Israel to see his kingdom further weakened by Jeroboam II. (2 Kings xiv. 28), and hear its overthrow predicted by the prophet Amos, for he may be the same with Mari whom Ramman-nirari, 803 B.C., conquered (Schrader, *KAT* 211 ff.); but it is not likely that he enjoyed so long a reign. If, therefore, this Benhadad is the son of Hazael, he is here mentioned merely as

[1] The accent of ושלחתי remains on the penult because the following word is a monosyllable. Ges.[25] 49, 3 R.

the successor of his father.[1] The force, then, of the parallelism is that the palace of the Syrian kings, with all its strength and beauty, shall be destroyed. Compare Pusey.

5. **the bar of Damascus:** the bar of bronze or iron, with which the gates of the cities were fastened (Jud. xvi. 3; 1 Kings iv. 3; Isa. xlv. 2), is here a symbol for the defenses of the capital. Its strength must yield before the instruments of Jehovah's vengeance. Damascus is here the city as distinguished from the kingdom (comp. *v.* 3). It was a very ancient city, for it had existed ever since Abraham migrated to Palestine (Gen. xiv. 5; xv. 1), and perhaps from a much earlier period. Moreover, it was wealthy and populous. Situated in a well-watered oasis on the line of traffic between eastern and western Asia, it had, in spite of the reverses that it had suffered, maintained its place among the foremost cities of the East. The same causes that made it what it was when Amos predicted its overthrow have repeatedly restored it and preserved to this day much of its beauty and importance. Its modern name is Demeshk-esh-Shams, Damascus of Syria, or, more briefly, esh-Shams, and it has a population of about 125,000. Thomson, *LB*, III. 361 ff. — **him who dwelleth therein,** lit. *a dweller:* the inhabitants of Bikath-awen; the people in distinction from the ruler; yet not necessarily all of them, for perhaps a remnant may be found among the Syrians who are to go into captivity. — **Bikath-awen:**

[1] The Septuagint here has *υἱοῦ Ἀδερ*, son of Adar, as if the Hebrew text were בן־הדר; and this is probably the original name, for in the Assyrian inscriptions, where the name of Benhadad II. occurs, he is always called Bin-hidri (Schrader, in Riehm, *HBA*). See also the reading הדר־עזר for הדד־עזר, 1 Chron. xviii. 3.

the literal meaning of these words is *valley of vanity*, and some of the earlier interpreters (*e.g.*, Jerome) were content to regard them as appellatives; but most modern commentators, with the Targum and Peshita, find in them, more or less disguised, the name of some particular locality. The most plausible hypothesis is that Amos here refers to the valley stretching nearly north and south between the two ranges of Lebanon, "the valley of Lebanon" of the book of Joshua (xi. 17; xii. 7), the Cœle-Syria of the Greeks, and el-Bukaʿa of the present day. In this valley was situated Baalbec (Baal-bukaʿa), whose ruined temples are still the admiration of travelers. It was also called Heliopolis, as a center of the sun- or Baal-worship imported from the city of the same name in Egypt. But the Egyptian name of that city was On (Gen. xli. 45). Hence it is supposed that Baalbec was sometimes called by the same name, and that Amos, slightly changing the vocalization, made of On, *Awen*, *vanity* or *idolatry;* and this supposition is rendered the more credible by the fact that Ezekiel (xxx. 17) treats in precisely the same way the name of the Egyptian On.[1] It is, then, the inhabitants of the beautiful valley of Lebanon, the devotees of the splendid worship at Baalbec, who are here threatened. — **him who holdeth the scepter:** the ruler in distinction from the subject. — **Beth-eden:** it is clear that this also must be regarded as a proper name (compare the Vulgate), but it is not so clear where the place which bore it was located. It has been identified with Ehden, on the

[1] The Septuagint renders מבקעת־און ἐκ πεδίου Ὤν; but this fact is valueless, since the Greek translators render און Ὤν even where it is substituted for אל in the name בית־אל by Hosea (iv. 15, v. 8, x. 5, 8).

eastern slope of Lebanon, near the great cedars (Baur); with Beit el-Janne, near the foot of Hermon, eastward (Rosenmuller); with Jubb Adin, near Malula, northeast of Damascus (Steiner); with Jusieh, near Riblah, north of Baalbec (Keil); and finally with the Eden of Eze. xxvii. 23, and the Bit-adini of the Assyrian inscriptions, a district on both sides of the middle Euphrates, whose inhabitants are called sons of Eden, 2 Kings xix. 12 and Isa. xxxvii. 12 (Riehm, *HBA;* Schrader, *KAT* 327). If the last suggestion is correct, "the holder of the scepter" must be explained as the ally or viceroy of the Syrian monarch. Wherever Beth-eden may have been situated, the general sense of the passage is evident. It threatens the Syrians, high and low, with slaughter.[1] — **the people of Aram:** those who have not been put to the sword. — **Kir:** the place from which, according to ix. 7, they emigrated, and to which, according to the Hebrew of 2 Kings xvi. 9, they were actually deported. The attempts to locate this region have thus far been unsuccessful. The favorite view has been that it was on or near the river Kur in northern Armenia (Baur). One of the latest conjectures places it in the region of Kuris, north of Aleppo (Socin), but a comparison of Isa. xxi. 2 with xxii. 6 would tempt one (with Bochart or Ritter) to look for it in Media. It is to be hoped that further research may lead to its identification.[2]

The difficulty of locating Kir makes it impossible

[1] The rendering of the Septuagint, *κατακόψω φυλὴν ἐξ ἀνδρῶν Χαρράν*, is quoted in support of the last hypothesis above mentioned (Riehm, *HBA*); but the translators were so evidently at sea with reference to the rest of the sentence that it does not seem strange to find them mistaking חרן for קרן.

[2] Note the curious mistake of the Septuagint.

to gather from this passage through whose instrumentality Amos expected Syria to be punished; but it appears from v. 27 that he believed Assyria appointed to overthrow Israel, and there is no reason for supposing that he had any other power in mind when threatening the surrounding nations with destruction. As a matter of fact Syria was, within a few years, subdued by Tiglath-pileser III. The first attack, according to the annals of this king, was made in 734 B.C. In 733 he laid siege to Damascus and, in 732, after completely devastating the surrounding country, he took the city, put to death Rezin, its king, and carried its people by thousands into captivity (Schrader, *KAT* 264 f.). Whether the captives were actually carried to Kir is uncertain, for though the Hebrew text of 2 Kings xvi. 9 so states, the Greek translation omits any exact destination.

2. PHILISTIA, *vv.* 6–8.

6. **Gaza**: here, as the largest town, represents Philistia, the narrow strip of territory along the shore of the Mediterranean, beginning just south of Jaffa, and extending to the Egyptian frontier. Its people were devoted to commerce, like the Phœnicians, but more warlike than their northern neighbors. It was the dread of their armies that made the Hebrews shun the direct route to Palestine, which, by the way, is but another form of the name Philistia (Ex. xiii. 17). They seem to have been partially conquered under Joshua (Jud. i. 18), but they soon regained their independence, and so thoroughly subdued the invaders (Jud. xv. 11) that it required the inspired enthusiasm of Samuel to rouse his people to resistance (1 Sam. vii. 3 ff.), and all the

skill and courage of Saul and David to accomplish their deliverance (1 Sam. xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. viii. 1). Even then the Philistines did not cease to be dangerous, but, especially after the division of the kingdom of David, took advantage of every opportunity to inflict injury upon their Hebrew neighbors. Thus it is related that, in the reign of Joram, they joined the Arabians in an attack upon Judah, when Jerusalem was captured and plundered, and many of its inhabitants, including almost the entire royal family, carried into captivity (2 Chron. xxi. 16 f.). It is not strange, therefore, that the Philistines should be found among the peoples condemned by Jehovah, or that Amos should be able to mention more than one transgression for which they deserved condemnation. — **they led completely captive:** made captive by wholesale (Jer. xiii. 19). The expression here used at once reminds one of the passage just quoted (2 Chron. xxi. 16 f.). The complete captivity can, therefore, hardly be any other than that in the reign of Joram (compare Orelli). — **to deliver to Edom**, the bitterest enemies of the Hebrews. Those who place Joel before Amos suppose Joel iv. 6 and this passage to refer to the same transaction, although Joel says that the captives were sold to *the sons of Javan.* The usual method of explaining the discrepancy is to suppose that, by the sons of Javan, not the Greeks (compare Gen. x. 4), but a tribe in the Arabian peninsula are intended (compare Henderson), and Eze. xxvii. 19 (compare *v.* 13) is quoted in support of this view.[1] The Edomites are thus made the middlemen by whom the captives were forwarded to their destination (Baur).

[1] Cornill proposes a change in the text of Eze. xxvii. 18 f. that would destroy the force of this reference.

7. **Gaza,** here the city, was the most southern of the five cities of which the Philistine confederacy was composed. Like Damascus, it owed its origin and importance to the necessities of commerce, and, like Damascus, though from time immemorial it has been a football for the nations of the Orient, it has remained to this day one of the most important cities of western Asia. It is still, under the name Ghuzzeh, a town of some 16,000 or 18,000 inhabitants. Thomson, *LB*, III. 179 ff.

8. **Ashdod:** Gr. *Azotus* (Acts viii. 40), near the coast, toward the northern border of Philistia, on the highway between Egypt and Syria, was also a city of importance. It was, according to 1 Sam. v., the seat of the worship of the fish-god, Dagon. It was always a fortress of consequence, but its strength must have been greatly increased after the days of Amos; for though Uzziah seems to have taken it without great difficulty (2 Chron. xxvi. 6), when attacked by Psammetichus, king of Egypt, it sustained the longest (29 years) siege on record. All that now remains of it is a miserable village on the ruins of its former strength, surrounded by gardens and orchards (Thomson, *LB* 158 ff.). — **him who holdeth the scepter:** each of these cities had its own king. Thus, *e.g.*, when Sennachrib invaded Philistia, 701 B.C., the king of Gaza was Zilbel, of Ashdod Mitinti, of Ashkelon Zidka, and of Ekron Padi (Schrader, *KAT* 291 ff.). — **Ashkelon:** at this time the only seaport of Philistia, was situated on the Mediterranean, north of Gaza, a little more than half the distance between it and Ashdod. It is famous as the birthplace of Herod the Great, who adorned it with splendid public buildings. In the period of the cru-

sades, on account of its strength it was called "the bride of Syria"; but it was finally, in 1270, destroyed by Sultan Bibars, and it has never since risen out of its ashes. The ruins which mark its site bear the name el-Jurah (Thomson, *LB*, III. 170 ff.). — **I will turn my hand against**: not in the sense of *turning* it *back* (Baur), but in that of *extending* it in a new movement. See 2 Sam. viii. 3. — **Ekron,** perhaps the least important of the cities of the Philistine confederacy, lay to the north-east of Ashdod, on the border of the kingdom of Judah. Its local deity was Beelzebub (2 Kings i. 2), the fly-god, who was identified with Satan by the later Jews (Matt. x. 25). No mention of Ekron is found in history after the crusades. Its site was unknown in modern times until Robinson identified it with a village called Akir, a few miles east of Jabneh (Robinson, *Res.* II. 227 ff.; Thomson, *LB*, III. 132 ff.). — **the remnant of the Philistines** does not mean the people of the remaining cities and villages not mentioned in the above enumeration, but, as in the case of Syria, Amos says, to close, that the people, *i.e.* all that are left, will be carried into captivity, so here he adds that the last of the Philistines, whether in the four cities mentioned or in any other part of the country, will perish. It has seemed strange that so important a town as Gath should not have been mentioned by the prophet, and various reasons have been given for its omission; *e.g.*, because it belonged to the kingdom of Judah (Kimchi); because it had been recovered by Uzziah (Baur); because it had been captured by Hazael (Hitzig); and finally, and this is doubtless the true explanation, because the mode of presentation adopted by Amos did not require a com-

plete enumeration of the Philistine Pentapolis. In the indictment, *v.* 6, Gaza alone stands for them all. Why should they all be mentioned in this sentence? In the following section (*vv.* 9–10) Tyre throughout represents Phœnicia. See Wellhausen, *SV*, V. — **the Lord Jehovah:** the most frequent compound designation for God in the book of Amos. See the Supplementary Studies II.[1]

Philistia, after having been partially conquered by Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 6),[2] like Syria, had to suffer at the hands of the Assyrians. In fact, as already stated, Tiglath-pileser III. gave it and Israel his first attention. In a fragmentary account of his expedition of 734 B.C. occurs the following reference to this region: "Hanno of Gaza, who had fled before my troops, escaped to Egypt. Gaza . . . [I conquered], its goods, its gods . . . [carried off], my . . . and my image [I set up]"; and in another inscription "Mitinti of Ashkelon," as well as "Hanno of Gaza," is mentioned among his tributaries (Schrader, *KAT* 255 ff.). Thus was fulfilled, as nearly, perhaps, as he himself expected, the prophecy of Amos concerning Philistia. It was, however, even more cruelly treated by Sargon (720 and 711 B.C.) and Sennachrib (701 B.C.), by whom it was so completely

[1] אדני יהוה is variously rendered in the Septuagint: in eight cases, *κύριος ὁ θεός*; in three, *κύριος κύριος*; and in eight, including this, simply *κύριος*. In this passage, perhaps the Septuagint has preserved the better reading, since אדני does not precede יהוה at the close of any other section in these first two chapters.

[2] In this passage, Ashdod as well as Gath is said to have been captured and rendered defenseless by the Judean king; hence these two cities must have been taken after the prophecy of Amos was written, and the omission of Gath by the prophet must have had some other reason than either of the first two above quoted.

subjugated that it never again resisted an Assyrian king (Schrader, *KAT* 396 f.; 398 ff.; 288 ff.; 355 ff.).

3. Phœnicia, *vv.* 9–10.

9. **Tyre:** here for Phœnicia, the narrow strip of territory along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, extending northward from Carmel, or some point slightly south of it, as far as Nahr el-Kebir. It included, besides Tyre, several other cities, the most important of which were Akko (Acts xxi. 7 Ptolemais, now Akka), Achzib (now Zib), Zarephath (now Serafend), Sidon, and Gebal (now Jabla). Its people were the foremost merchants and navigators of antiquity. It was not for their interest to make war upon their neighbors, therefore, though they clung to their possessions along the coast (Josh. xiii. 6), they generally maintained peaceful relations with the Hebrews. The king of Tyre entered into a treaty with David (2 Sam. v. 11), which was renewed when Solomon came to the throne (1 Kings v. 1 ff.). The intimacy between the two peoples continued long after the Hebrews had been divided into two kingdoms. Ahab, king of Israel, married Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians (1 Kings xvi. 31), *i.e.* of the Phœnicians (Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 13, 2), and their daughter Athaliah became the wife, and finally the successor, of Ahaziah, king of Judah (2 Kings xi. 1). Thus the Hebrews were at one time virtually governed by Phœnician princesses. The reaction which resulted in the death of both of these infamous women must have had some effect upon the relations of the Hebrews with the Phœnicians. At any rate it was not long before the prophets began to threaten Phœnicia with destruction,

and they maintained this attitude toward it to the end (Joel iii. 4 ff.; Isa. xxiii.; Jer. xxv. 22; Eze. xxvi.). — **they delivered a complete captivity:** the Phœnicians are not charged with *taking* captives, as are the Philistines (*v.* 6), but with *delivering* them, *i.e.* acting as agents for those who actually took them. Since the captives in this case also were delivered to the Edomites, it is natural to suppose that the same are meant as in the previous instance, *viz.* those taken during the invasion of Judah by the Philistines, in the reign of Joram. The Phœnicians probably followed the earlier, as they did the later, invaders of Judea, "with silver and gold very much," "to buy the children of Israel for slaves" (1 Macc. iii. 41). — **a brotherly covenant:** not a covenant between brethren, *i.e.* Edom and Israel (Ewald); it is far better to suppose that the intimate relations between the Hebrews and the Phœnicians are intended. There is express mention of a league between Hiram and Solomon 1 Kings v. 12, and 1 Kings ix. 13 the former calls the latter *brother.* Perhaps a better translation of the above phrase would be *a covenant to be brethren.* See 1 Kings xx. 33.

10. **Tyre:** here the city, the capital of Phœnicia, and the commercial metropolis of the ancient world. The city proper was situated on an island just off the coast of Phœnicia, directly west of Mount Hermon. Its situation accounts both for the degree and the duration of its prosperity, for not only did it early eclipse Sidon and become "the merchant of the peoples to many coasts," but for centuries it successfully resisted all attempts to capture it and succumbed at last, 332 B.C., only after a long siege, to Alexander. It was not completely hum-

bled until 1191 A.D. when it was destroyed by the Moslems. On the ruins, still connected with the mainland by the causeway built by Alexander, has since arisen a new town, but it is an insignificant place of only about 3500 inhabitants, having nothing in common with the ancient city but its romantic site and the once magical name Sur (Thomson, *LB*, II. 607 ff.).

The prophecy against Phœnicia, as has already been hinted, was not fulfilled so literally as that against Syria, or even Philistia. The Phœnicians, with characteristic discretion, secured the favor of Tiglath-pileser III. by paying him tribute from his first appearance, 743 B.C., in the west (Schrader, *KAT* 250, 252 f.). When, therefore, in 734, he made his expedition into Philistia, they probably suffered only to the extent of the presents that they sent him (Schrader, *KAT* 257 f.). Even when, later, they entered into a league with their neighbors to throw off the Assyrian yoke, though the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by Sargon, and Isaiah expected that Phœnicia also would be completely conquered (Isa. xxiii.), Tyre, at least, escaped, after a siege of five years, with comparatively slight injury (Josephus *Ant.* ix. 14, 2). The prophecy of Amos, however, was fulfilled in that Tyre, with the rest of Phœnicia, was actually conquered and forced to pay tribute to the Assyrian kings to the end of this great monarchy (Schrader, *KAT* 288 ff.; 355 f.).

4. Edom, *vv.* 11–12.

11. **Edom:** this name seems sometimes to have covered the whole territory on both sides of the Arabah south of the Dead Sea (Eze. xxv. 8 ff.), but it was

strictly applied only to the mountainous region east of the Arabah, inhabited by the sons of Esau. Its principal cities were Elath and Ezion-geber, on the Red Sea, Sela in the mountains, and Bosrah toward the northern extremity of the country. Its people were largely free-booters (Gen. xxvii. 39 f.). As such they were the dread of the Hebrews during the Exodus (Num. xx. 21), and a thorn in their flesh after the occupation of Palestine. Subdued by David (2 Sam. viii. 14; 2 Kings xi. 15; Ps. lx. 8), they continued subject to the kings of Judah (1 Kings x. 26) until the reign of Joram, when they revolted (2 Chron. xxi. 10), thenceforth remaining independent until reconquered by Amasiah (2 Kings xiv. 7; 2 Chron xxv. 11) and Uzziah (2 Kings xiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxvi. 2). — **he pursued his brother with the sword:** this expression as fitly characterizes the entire course of the Edomites toward the Hebrews as any particular act in it. The second clause, however, indicates that, on the occasion in question, the condition of the objects of their hostility was such as naturally to excite sympathy. Now, this must have been the state of things in the reign of Joram, under whom Edom revolted; when, according to 2 Chron. xxi. 16 f., the Philistines and their allies invaded Judah. Perhaps, therefore, that event is here again recalled. Compare Keil. The tie between Edom and Israel, unlike that mentioned *v.* 9, was a natural one. The Hebrews recognized it (Deut. xxiii. 7). They had before appealed to it in vain (Num. xx. 14). See Ob. 10. — **stifling his pity**, lit. *and corrupted his pity*,[1] *i.e.* suppressed the natural instinct to sympa-

[1] The construction is here changed, the Perfect being substituted for the Infinitive Construct. For the tense, see Ges.[25] 112, 3. *a.* δ; 114, 3 R.

thize with distress. Compare Eze. xxviii. 17. — **his wrath ever rent:** did not exhaust itself with one act of cruelty. See Job xvi. 9.[1] — **his fury he nursed,** lit. *his fury he kept it.* This clause is an intensification of the second, just as the preceding is of the first, specification. The Edomites were not only pitiless, but they *cherished* vengeful emotions.[2]

12. **Teman:** originally the name of a descendant of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 11), was afterward applied to a district, perhaps to a city (Job ii. 11) of Edom. Where the city or district was situated it is now impossible to determine. Jerome says (*i.l.*) that it lay in the south, but Eze. xxv. 13 indicates that it is rather to be sought in the north of Edom. Kautsch (Riehm, *HBA*) suggests that it may be identified with the Gebal of Ps. lxxxiii. 8, and with this suggestion agrees the description in the *Onomastikon:* "regio principum Edom in terra Gebalitica." Here, as in Jer. xlix. 20, the name Teman is applied to the whole of Edom. See ii. 2, 5. — **Bosrah:** not the Bosrah of Jer. xlviii. 24, which was in Moab, but a city, at one time probably the capital of Edom, which has been identified with el-Busaireh, a small village surrounded by extensive ruins, in the district of

[1] For ויטרף Olshausen (Ps. ciii. 9) proposes to read ויטר, and Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) adopts this emendation.

עד can doubtless here, as in Isa. ix. 5, mean booty; but נצח in the following clause would seem to indicate that this is not the meaning intended. Compare Siegfried and Stade, *Lexicon*, art. טרף. The translators of the Septuagint evidently pointed the word עֵד; hence *εἰς μαρτύριον*.

[2] שמרה is not the 3 sing. fem. for שָׁמְרָה (Ewald), but the 3 sing. mas. with a fem. suffix for שְׁמָרָהּ. The tone was shifted to the penult to prevent two accented syllables from coming together, and then the *mappik* fell out of the last letter. Ges. 58, 3, R 1. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) avoids any difficulty by dropping the ה.

Jebal (Gebal), about $2\frac{3}{4}$ hours south of Tufileh (Robinson, *Res.* II. 167). The Edomites, who had already paid tribute to Ramman-nirari III. (Schrader, *KAT* 190), terrified by the vigor with which Tiglath-pileser III. dealt with Syria, Israel, and Philistia, returned to their allegiance to the Great King (*KAT* 257 f.); and thenceforward, so long as the Assyrian empire lasted, though they sometimes rebelled, they never succeeded in ridding themselves of its yoke. Sennacherib (*KAT* 288 ff.), Esarhaddon (*KAT* 355 f.), and Assurbanipal (*KAT* 355 f.) all reckon them among the vassals of Assyria.

5. Ammon, *vv.* 13–15.

13. **the children of Ammon:** the descendants of Ammon, son of Lot, by the younger of the daughters who fled with him from Sodom (Gen. xix. 38). At first, with the Moabites, they occupied the territory along the eastern side of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, from the Jabbok to the Arnon (Jud. xi. 13; Josh. xiii. 25); but they were driven by the Amorites eastward across the upper Jabbok, where the Israelites, after the Exodus, found them (Num. xxi. 24; comp. Deut. ii. 19). They did not accept this situation as final; hence, when the Hebrews had expelled the Amorites, they renewed their attempts to regain their former possessions (Jud. x. 8). They were defeated by Jephthah (Jud. xi. 32), but had to be again expelled from Gilead by Saul (1 Sam. xi. 11), and finally, though assisted by the Syrians (2 Sam. x. 8), completely conquered by David (2 Sam. xii. 31). When his kingdom was divided they naturally became tributary to Israel, but they probably did not long remain in this condition (2 Chron. xx. 1).

At any rate, they had become independent when Amos prophesied, else they would hardly have found a place in his indictment, and Uzziah would not have had occasion to make war with them (2 Chron. xxvi. 8). — **they disemboweled the pregnant women of Gilead :** the crime of which the Ammonites are accused was not infrequent in their day (2 Kings xv. 16; see Hos. x. 14; Isa. xiii. 16; Nah. iii. 10). That they were not incapable of such an outrage appears from the inhuman proposition that they made to the people of Jabesh-Gilead (1 Sam. xi. 1). Perhaps it was their notorious inhumanity that led David to treat them with such cruelty as he permitted after the capture of Rabbah (2 Sam. xii. 31). When the outrage described was committed it is perhaps impossible to determine with certainty, but there are strong indications that it was connected with the invasion of Gilead by Hazael (2 Kings x. 32). The Ammonites would naturally make common cause with the Syrians, as they did in the time of David (2 Sam. x. 8), and Hazael, who was, in fact, accused by Elisha of being capable of this very crime (2 Kings viii. 12), would be just the leader to permit it in his followers.[1] — **for the sake of enlarging their border :** the purpose denoted is a constant and controlling one, of which the act above described was but a single manifestation. It is implied

[1] There is another interpretation of the passage. Kimchi, *e.g.*, translates it, *because they brake through the mountains of Gilead*, accounting for the indignation of the prophet at this offense by saying that the Ammonites thus violated the law forbidding the removal of boundaries, and incurred the curse pronounced upon such sinners (Deut. xxvii. 17). This, however, is but a subtle attempt of the Jewish exegetes to avoid the mention of a horrible crime. The form הרות cannot be derived from הר *mountain;* and, if it could, the other interpretation would still be required by the known character of the Ammonites.

that the desire to extend their territory, which at first may have had a warrant so far as Gilead was concerned, had become so strong that they would not have hesitated at any atrocity by which this passion was to be satisfied. Compare ii. 7.[1]

14. **I will kindle fire** is a mere variation in expression. — **Rabbah,** or Rabbath (Eze. xxv. 5), or, more fully, Rabbah of the children of Ammon (Deut. iii. 11), the only city of the Ammonites whose name is given in the Hebrew scriptures (comp. 2 Sam. xii. 31), was situated at the head of the Jabbok. That it had been a powerful stronghold appears from the time spent by David's troops before it (2 Sam. xi. 1). In the days of the prophets it had regained some of its former importance (Jer. xlix. 3; Eze. xxv. 5). Later still, under the patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.), after whom it was called Philadelphia, it became one of the most important cities east of the Jordan. At the beginning of the Christian era it was a member of the group of cities known as Decapolis (Matt. iv. 25). The ruins of the temples, theatres, etc., with which the city was once adorned, now bear the name Amman (Thomson, *LB*, III. 607 ff.; Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, 399 ff.; Oliphant, *Land of Gilead*, 251 ff.). — **with clamor:** not the cries of the terrified Ammonites (Marck), but the shouts and signals of their oncoming enemies (Josh. vi. 5; Num. x. 6). These words clearly show that in these first two chapters Amos uses *fire* figuratively for *war*. — **with commotion in a day of tempest:** here the prophet again falls into figurative language, which, however, is

[1] On the particle למען and its significance see my dissertation: *Some Final Constructions in Biblical Hebrew.*

easily understood. The *tempest* is not a commotion of the elements manifesting the wrath of Jehovah (Marck), but the tumultuous attack in which the capital of Ammon is to be *stormed* and captured.

15. **their king**: the king of the Ammonites.[1] See *their border*, *v.* 13. — **he and his princes**: Jer. xlix. 3 reads *his priests and his princes*.[2]

The Ammonites were involved in the same fate that befell the rest of the peoples of Western Asia; but it is impossible to give the details of their subjugation. We only know that, after the invasion of Tiglath-pileser they always appear as tributaries to the Assyrian monarchy (Schrader, *KAT* 257 f., 288 ff., 355 ff.).

6. Moab, ii. 1–3.

1. **Moab**: the people descended from the son of Lot by the older of the two daughters who fled with him to Zoar (Gen. xix. 37). The Hebrews, when they entered Palestine, found them in the mountainous region east of the Dead Sea, between the Arnon (Num. xxi. 13) and the so-called brook of the willows (Isa. xv. 7), Wadi el-Ahsi, whither they had been driven by the Amorites (Jud. xi. 25). Balak did not attempt to molest his new neighbors except by his incantations (Num.

[1] This is without doubt the correct reading. It is required by the phrase *his princes* as well as by the analogy of ii. 3, and it is supported by the Targum and the Septuagint. The other Greek versions, however, render מלכם as if it were the name of the god Molech, and so do the Peshita and the Vulgate. In fact, Jeremiah, according to the correct reading, in his prophecy concerning Ammon (xlix. 3), lends his authority to this interpretation. Perhaps Amos, when he wrote the word מלכם, meant that it should *suggest* מִלְכֹּם to his readers.

[2] The Septuagint adopts the rendering of Jeremiah.

xxii. 6), but a later king, Eglon, got possession of the country north of the Arnon, and, crossing the Jordan, occupied Jericho, whence he held the Hebrews in subjection eighteen years (Jud. iii. 13). After his assassination and the retreat of the Moabites across the Jordan, the two nations seem to have lived at peace with each other until the time of Saul. During this period Naomi found a home among the Moabites (Ruth i. 4). Even after the election of Saul, although, or perhaps because, they had suffered at the hands of this king (1 Sam. xiv. 47), their country furnished a refuge for the family of David (1 Sam. xxii. 3; see xxvii. 3). When David himself became king, he very ungratefully, as it would seem without further knowledge of the circumstances, made them his servants (2 Sam. viii. 2), and they probably remained until after the division of the kingdom tributary to his successors (1 Kings xi. 1). They then, perhaps, for a time became independent. At any rate, Omri of Israel, who claimed their territory, was obliged to make good his claim with the sword, which, however, he so thoroughly accomplished that Moab remained attached to his kingdom until the death of Ahab (2 Kings iii. 4). Then the Moabites, under Mesha, revolted (2 Kings iii. 5), and all the attempts of the kings of Israel, even with the assistance of Jehoshaphat, reinforced by the Edomites, proved unsuccessful (2 Kings iii. 6 ff.). It is probable that even Jeroboam II. was content to drive them within their own borders (vi. 14), and prevent the inroads to which his predecessors, while at war with Syria, had to submit (2 Kings xiii. 20). — **he burned the bones of the king of Edom to lime:** by *the bones* is meant the body (vi. 10), and *to*

lime is equivalent to the English expression *to ashes.* Tradition says that the deed here described was committed by Mesha, the contemporary of Jehoshaphat, and certainly all that can be learned of him goes to confirm this opinion. The Moabite stone, on which he recounts his achievements, agrees with the Hebrew scriptures (2 Kings iii. 26 f.) in representing him as reckless and vengeful to the last degree. The latter further represents the king of Edom as among his bitterest enemies. It is, therefore, more than possible that, after the war in which the Edomites, under Jehoshaphat, took the part of Israel (perhaps not until Jehoshaphat was dead and they, having revolted, could no longer resist him), Mesha invaded their country, and, rifling the tomb of his old adversary, who had also meanwhile died, burned his body and scattered the ashes to the winds. To be deprived of burial is, by the prophets, regarded as one of the sorest penalties with which men can be threatened (Jer. xxxvi. 30). It is not strange, therefore, that the violation of the graves of the dead should be reckoned among crimes the most heinous, and that without regard to the question against whom the offence is committed; for there is no reason for supposing that Amos condemned Moab for the deed done merely because the king of Edom in the case was an ally of Jehoshaphat, and thus a crime against him was a crime against the chosen people (Keil). Our prophet does not descend to such subtleties.[1]

[1] The following is the inscription on the Moabite stone as translated by Driver in the introduction to his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, lxxxvii. ff.: —

2. **Moab:** here the country, hence *v.* 3, *her midst*, and *her princes*, as well as *with him*, *i.e.* the people Moab. — **Keriyyoth:** not *the cities* (Septuagint), but a city of Moab (Jer. xlviii. 24), and evidently an important one, else it would not, here and Jer. xlviii. 41, be put for Moab, as in the preceding chapter Damascus is for

1 I am Mesha', son of Chemosh-melek, king of Moab, the Da-
-ibonite. My father reigned over Moab for 30 years, and I reign-
-ed after my father. And I made this high place for Chemosh in
QRḤH, a high place of sal-
-vation, because he had saved me from all the kings (?), and because
he had let me see my pleasure on all them that hated me. Omr-
5 -i was king over Israel, and he afflicted Moab for many days, because
Chemosh was angry with his la-
-nd. And his son succeeded him; and he also said, I will afflict
Moab. In my days said he th[us;]
but I saw my pleasure on him, and on his house, and Israel perished
with an everlasting destruction. And Omri took possession of
the [la-]
-nd of Mehedeba, and it (*i.e.* Israel) dwelt therein, during his days,
and half his son's days, forty years; but [resto-]
-red it Chemosh in my days. And I built Ba'al-Me'on, and I made
in it the reservoir (?); and I built
10 Qiryathen. And the men of Gad had dwelt in the land of 'Aṭaroth
from of old; and built for himself the king of I-
srael 'Aṭaroth. And I fought against the city, and took it. And I
slew all the [people of]
the city, a gazing-stock unto Chemosh, and unto Moab. And I brought
back (*or*, took captive) thence the altar-hearth of Davdoh (?), and
I drag-
-ged it before Chemosh in Qeriyyoth. And I settled therein the men
of SHRN, and the men of
MḤRTH. And Chemosh said unto me, Go, take Nebo against
Israel. And I
15 went by night, and fought against it from the break of dawn until
noon. And I too-
-k it, and slew the whole of it, 7,000 men, and . . ., and women,
and . . .

Syria, etc. This fact, and the further circumstance that it and Ar are never mentioned in the same connection, has led to the conjecture that Ar and Keriyyoth are but different names for the capital of Moab, now Mahatet el-Haj. The Moabite stone (l. 13) confirms this conclusion. See Riehm, *HBA;* compare Smith, *BD.* — **amid**

-s, and maid-servants; for I had devoted it to 'Ashtor-Chemosh. And I took thence the [ves-]
-sels of YAHWEH, and I dragged them before Chemosh. And the king of Israel had built
Yahaẓ, and abode in it, while he fought against me. But Chemosh drove him out before me; and
I took of Moab 200 men, even all its chiefs; and I led them up against Yaḥaẓ, and took it
to add it unto Daibon. I built QRḤH, the wall of Ye'arim (*or*, of the woods), and the wall of
the Mound. And I built its gates, and I built its towers. And
I built the king's palace, and I made the two reser[voirs (?) for wa]ter in the midst of
the city. And there was no cistern in the midst of the city, in QRḤH, and I said to all the people, Make
you every man a cistern in his house. And I cut out the cutting for QRḤH with the help of prisoner-
[-s of] Israel. I built 'Aro'er, and I made the highway by the Arnon.
I built Beth-Bamoth, for it was pulled down. I built Beẓer, for ruins
[had it become, and the chie]fs of Daibon were fifty, for all Daibon was obedient (to me). And I reign-
-ed [over] an hundred [chiefs] in the cities which I added to the land. And I buil-
-t Mehede[b]a, and Beth-Diblathen, and Beth-Ba'al-Me'on; and I took there the sheep grazers (?),
. . . sheep of the land, and as for Ḥoronen, there dwelt therein . . . and . . .
. . . Chemosh said unto me, Go down, fight against Ḥoronen. And I went down . . .
. . . [and] Chemosh [resto]red it in my days. And I went up thence to . . .
. . . And I . . . . . .

tumult: Jeremiah, evidently with this passage in mind, calls the Moabites *sons of tumult* (xlviii. 45). See also Num. xxiv. 17 (R.V.) and A. B. Davidson, *Expositor*, March, 1887. Here, however, the tumult is not that raised by the Moabites, but that, like the roar of the sea for loudness and awfulness (Ps. lxv. 8), of attacking enemies (i. 14), more clearly defined in the succeeding words, — *with clamor, with the sound of the trumpet.*[1]

3. **the judge:** not a governor or viceroy appointed by the king of Israel (Hitzig), since, when Amos wrote, Moab was not subject to Jeroboam, but the king, the chief among the princes of the land, like the Carthaginian suffete (compare i. 15). The office of judge was the most important which an oriental monarch had to exercise. — **all her princes:** see note on Moab, *v.* 2. — **with him:** the judge or king.

The details of the relations of the Moabites to the avenging power, whose advent was foreseen by Amos, are not known. It is, however, known that Salman the Moabite, willingly or unwillingly, paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser (Schrader, *KAT* 257 f.), Kamoshnadab to Sennacherib (id. 288 ff.), and Mussuri, who, by the way, is expressly called a king in the inscriptions, to Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal (id. 355 f.).

7. Judah, *vv.* 4–5.

4. **Judah:** including Benjamin, the southern kingdom in distinction from the other ten tribes, or Israel in the narrower sense (1 Kings xii. 20 f.). The history of these two tribes presents an almost constant struggle

[1] Hoffmann finds in שאון an ancient name for perhaps the acropolis of Ar, here used as a synonym for Moab, like Zion for Jerusalem (i. 2).

between the true and false religions. Under their very first king they are said to have done "evil in the sight of Jehovah," and "provoked him to jealousy with their sins which they committed, above all that their fathers had done" (1 Kings xiv. 21; 2 Chron. xii. 1). Abijah (1 Kings xv. 3; comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 10), Joram (2 Kings viii. 18; 2 Chron. xxi. 6), and Ahaziah (2 Kings ix. 27; 2 Chron. xxii. 13) favored this tendency, while Athaliah (2 Kings xi. 3; 2 Chron. xxii. 12) openly deserted the worship of Jehovah. Even the good kings, Asa (1 Kings xv. 11; 2 Chron. xiv. 2), Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 43; 2 Chron. xvii. 3), Joash (2 Kings xii. 2 f.; 2 Chron. xxiv. 2, 18), and Amasiah (2 Kings xiv. 3; 2 Chron. xxv. 2), when they were best, fell far below their father David, and the historian has to qualify his commendation in each case with a confession that the high-places of the country were not removed. Indeed, one gets the impression that there had been a growing estrangement between Jehovah and his people, and that, therefore, when Amos appeared to warn Israel, Judah had reached an advanced stage of apostasy. — **the law of Jehovah:** the word *law* in the Old Testament is used in the broad sense of *instruction*, and in this sense it is applied to the advice of elders (Prov. i. 8), to the oracles of priests (Jer. xviii. 18), and to the deliverances of prophets (Isa. i. 10). Such instruction is the law of Jehovah in so far as the one giving it is moved by the spirit of Jehovah. There is, however, no doubt that in many cases, particularly in the later books, the word implies a collection of precepts recognized as authoritative by the Hebrews (2 Kings xxii. 8). The latter is the most natural interpretation of its use in this passage, especially in view of

its connection with the parallel *statutes*, which is a frequent designation for the law of Moses (Jer. xliv. 10; Eze. xx. 11; Mal. iii. 22). Compare Gunning. The Jews, then, be it observed, are not, like the heathen nations, and finally Israel, accused of violating, in some particular, the unwritten law of God, but of ignoring a distinct and comprehensive revelation of the will of Jehovah. On the genuineness of this passage see Introductory Studies III. — **the lies,** lit. *their lies;* their worthless idols or images.[1] For these the fathers deserted Jehovah while he was in the very act of revealing himself to them (Ex. xxxii. 1; Deut. ix. 12), and for these the sons, after generations of Jehovah's guidance, rejected him like their fathers.

5. **Jerusalem:** the capital of Judah, and the peculiar abode of Jehovah (i. 2), situated on the border between Judah and Ephraim, about thirty-six miles from the Mediterranean Sea, and two-thirds as far from the river Jordan. It, like Damascus, was a very ancient city, for it also, according to tradition, was "before Abraham" (Gen. xiv. 6; Ps. lxxvi. 2). It was temporarily occupied by the Hebrews when they entered Palestine (Jud. i. 8), but it remained for David to gain complete and lasting possession of it (2 Sam. v. 11 ff.). He strengthened its already strong fortifications and wisely made it his capital (2 Sam. v. 9). Solomon completed the defenses begun by his father (1 Kings iii. 1; xi. 27) and adorned the city with magnificent buildings, the most famous of which was the temple, a masterpiece of

[1] With this use of כזב compare that of און, Isa. lxvi. 3; אליל, Lev. xix. 4; הבל, Jer. viii. 19, Ps. xxxi. 7; לא־אלהים, Jer. v. 7. The Septuagint adds ἃ ἐποίησαν.

Tyrian workmanship (1 Kings vi. 37 f.; vii. 1 f.). Since Solomon's death Jerusalem had lost much of its earlier magnificence. Three times it had been captured and plundered, first by the Egyptians under Shishak, in the reign of Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 25 f.; 2 Chron. xii. 1 f.), a second time by the Arabians and Philistines, in the reign of Joram (2 Chron. xxi. 16 f.), and a third time by Israel under Jehoash, in the reign of Amasiah (2 Kings xiv. 13 f.; 2 Chron. xxv. 23 f.). It must, however, still have been a beautiful city when Amos prophesied its overthrow, and the destruction of its palaces.

The kingdom of Judah was not invaded by the victorious armies of Tiglath-pileser III., but it did not escape its share of the misfortunes predicted by Amos. Ahaz was obliged to rob the temple of Jehovah to purchase the doubtful aid of the Assyrian king (2 Kings xvi. 8; 2 Chron. xxviii. 20 f.), and thenceforward pay him a heavy tribute (Schrader, *KAT* 257 f.; 263 f.). Hezekiah, his successor, also remained some time subject to Assyria (Schrader, *KAT* 188). When he finally rebelled he barely escaped subjugation by Sennacherib (2 Kings xix. 35; 2 Chron. xxxii. 21). He did not avoid a heavy fine (2 Kings xviii. 14; Schrader, *KAT* 288 ff.). Manasseh was a vassal of Esarhaddon, and for some time also of Assurbanipal. It was, perhaps, the latter against whom he rebelled when he was carried a prisoner in chains to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11). The Assyrian empire fell, but forty years later, at the hands of the Babylonians, Judah suffered the fate of the northern kingdom (2 Kings xxv. 1 ff.; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17 ff.).

8. Israel, *vv.* 6–16.

Having, by his condemnation, one after another, of the neighboring peoples, awakened in his hearers (or readers) a perhaps not altogether commendable interest in his message, Amos now turns upon Israel and arraigns them in even severer terms than he has hitherto used. First he rehearses some of their wicked practices, then recalls, by way of contrast, some of the gracious dealings of Jehovah, and finally pictures the dreadful result of sinning against such mercy.

a. Israel's Wickedness, vv. 6–8. — 6. **three, yea four, times:** the meaning of this expression is the same here as in the preceding paragraphs, — *repeatedly.* The sins, therefore, which find mention in the following verses, do not make a complete catalogue. They are samples of the wickedness of Israel. More are cited than in previous cases, not merely because Amos wished to represent Israel as worse than their neighbors, although that impression is the natural result, but because, in this case, a moral effect is to be produced. As a matter of fact, four distinct offenses are detailed, — unprincipled avarice, unfeeling oppression, unblushing immorality, and unbridled voluptuousness. — **they sell:**[1] most interpreters give the word *sell* in this passage a double sense, making a figurative application of it to the *righteous* or *guiltless*, and a literal to the *needy*. They then further explain that the *righteous* was pronounced guilty and thus *sold* to his accuser by a corrupt judge *for money* received as a bribe, while the *needy*, because he could not pay a debt amounting to only so much as

[1] מִכְרֹם is for מָכְרָם, as in Neh. xiii. 15. Compare מָכְרָה, Ex. xxi. 8. Ges.[25] 61, 1, R 1.

would buy *a pair of shoes*, was actually adjudged the slave (Ex. xxi. 2 ff.; Lev. xxv. 39 ff.; Deut. xv. 12 ff.; 2 Kings iv. 1) of his accuser (Baur, Keil). Some have insisted upon the literal signification of *sell*, but they have been forced to give to the word *righteous* the meaning *upright* (Gen. xviii. 23), rather than *innocent*, since, if the accused were not a debtor, and therefore *guilty* before the law, there would be no excuse for enslaving him. He must, therefore, have been "a harmless debtor," whom, because he could not pay the *money* that he owed, even when it was not more than would buy *a pair of shoes*, the judge, who was therefore not necessarily corrupt, but was, perhaps, inhuman, *sold* as a slave to his creditor (Hitzig, Orelli). Both of these interpretations are unsatisfactory. Let us try the effect of giving to the word *sell* only the derived meaning above mentioned (Gunning). The sellers were, as all agree, the noble and powerful in Israel, acting as judges (vi. 1), and those to whom they sold were plaintiffs in the proceedings over which these judges presided. What, then, is the meaning of **for money?** The persons who sold could not be said to have sold in any sense, unless there were a consideration. Hence it is natural and necessary to suppose that Amos meant to accuse these judges of betraying some one *for money* which they received in the shape of a bribe (v. 12). But, as above suggested, it would not be necessary to offer them a bribe if the accused were guilty in the eye of the law, hence **the guiltless** must be explained as a person who had been unjustly accused, and whom his judges could not justly condemn (Wellhausen, *SV*, V.). Let us now apply the same meaning of *sell* to the second clause. —

the needy, also, was sold, *i.e.* betrayed by his judges. But in this, as in the preceding case, there should be a consideration. Most commentators find it only implied. It is better, however, to see it in the words — **a pair of shoes:** if it is objected that *a pair of shoes* was not the equivalent of "the poorest slave" (Hitzig), it must be remembered that the pair of shoes, or rather the trifling sum that would buy them, was not the price of the person of the accused, but of the integrity of his judges. They were so corrupt that, for the trifling sum that his persecutor could afford to pay for judgment against him, they pronounced the innocent guilty, or, to put it otherwise, they betrayed for money, however little, the guiltless, even when he was at the same time needy. The hapless defendant might thus lose not merely his substance, if he had any, or his freedom, but even his life. The second clause is thus made to strengthen the first and the whole to describe the extent to which the greed for money had mastered Israel.[1] Such conduct was plainly contrary to God's law (Ex. xxiii. 6–8), but Amos does not appeal to any external revelation. Compare viii. 6.

7. This verse contains the second and third counts in the indictment. The first is — **Nay, they pant for dust of the earth upon the heads of the lowly:** *i.e.* they, the powerful, are eager to bring dust of the earth upon the

[1] The verb מכר is several times used in the sense here required, *e.g.*, Jud. ii. 14; Ps. xliv. 13. For צדיק = *guiltless, innocent*, see Ex. xxiii. 7, Prov. xviii. 17; and for בעבור = *for the sake of*, 1 Sam. xii. 22, but especially Am. viii. 6. Hoffmann takes עבור in the sense of *produce* (Josh. v. 11 f.), and explains נעלים as a token (Ru. iv. 7), thus getting the rendering, *for the produce of* [land of the debtor secured to the judge by] *a pair of shoes.*

heads of the lowly; or, without either figure, they are eager to bring the lowly into distress; for dust or ashes on the head was, among the Hebrews, a sign of grief or misery (Josh. vii. 6; Lam. ii. 10). Slightly different from this is the interpretation according to which the dust is that which is brought upon the heads of the lowly by crushing them to, or dragging them upon, the ground (Ibn Ezra). Quite different is a third, according to which the powerful are so eager for landed possessions (Isa. v. 8) that they begrudge the lowly the little dust that these latter cast upon their heads in token of their misery (Hitzig). This last interpretation seems growing in favor (see Duhm, *TP* 111).[1] The main thought, and that which especially arouses the indignation of the prophet,[2] is the eagerness with which the lowly are oppressed. The next sentence gives an illustration of the *way* in which dust is brought upon their heads. They, the powerful — **turn aside the way of the humble:** the way of the humble is not their course (Baur, Gunning). Amos used a different

[1] Hoffmann translates על *in addition to*, and thus gets the rendering: *they pant for the head* (person) *of the lowly in addition to the dust of the earth* (his land), — which is far-fetched and awkward. Equally indefensible, because, though supported by all the great versions, it lacks lexical authority, is the translation of Baur, who renders שאפים as if it were שפים from שוף (see Gen. iii. 15, but compare Dillman's commentary), and the whole sentence: *who tread* (Sept. τὰ πατοῦντα; Vulg. *qui conterunt*) *on the dust on the heads of the lowly.* Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) derives שאפים from שוף, but he ignores the next three words, rendering: *crush the head of the lowly.* Compare the Targum.

[2] The participle with the article has here the force of an impatient epithet. See Ps. xix. 11; Ges. 126, 1. *b.* *The panters*, however, would not sound as well as *nay* with the Present. In the following sentence this construction is changed to the Imperfect, denoting repeated or customary action.

expression for the violation of justice (v. 12). It is rather their path in life, the walk by which they are characterized (Ps. i. 6). This was *turned*, or, rather, they were turned from it, when they were hindered in the pursuit of their modest aims, or deprived of the simple blessings with which they were satisfied, by those who went out of *their* way to oppress them. This was regarded a grievous sin under both covenants (Job xxiv. 4; Matt. xviii. 6). — **A man also and his father go to the maid:** this is the third count. The *man* is any man. The meaning, therefore, is that young and old are guilty of the offence charged. The maid is not necessarily the same maid (Keil). The article is generic, and the maid is the *strange woman* whose blandishments are described in the Proverbs (vii. 6 ff.), the harlot.[1] Such women were sometimes found in the service of heathen divinities (Hos. iv. 14), and it is not impossible that Amos had this class of prostitutes in mind (Steiner).[2] If that is the case, he had reason for the strong expression that follows — **for the sake of profaning my holy name:** for, though sin of any sort was a profanation of the name of Jehovah (Lev. xxii. 32), such wholesale impurity practiced, perhaps, at the very shrine once dedicated to his worship (Gen. xii. 8; xxviii. 22), must have seemed to the prophet nothing short of a deliberate insult to the Almighty.[3] See Lev. xx. 1 ff.

8. The fourth and last count, like the first, contains two specifications; first, — **They even stretch themselves**

[1] Ges. 126, 4. The Septuagint has *τὴν αὐτὴν παιδίσκην.*

[2] Hoffmann, by changing and otherwise doing violence to the text, gets: *A man and his judge* (אב) *deal according to agreement* (הַנַּעֲרָה).

[3] The Septuagint has *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν.*

on garments taken in pledge: the garments were the outer garments that Orientals use not only during the day, but also during the night. Indeed, the poor have almost no other bedding. It was, therefore, but humane that, as the earliest code known to the Hebrews provided (Ex. xxii. 26), whenever a poor man had been obliged to pawn his cloak it should always be returned to him at night. Amos charges the usurers in Israel with disregarding this merciful provision and even spreading the garments of the poor on their couches at their religious feasts.[1] — **beside every altar:** there were various altars. Jeroboam I. had dedicated at least two, one at Bethel, the other at Dan, to a form of the worship of Jehovah (1 Kings xii. 29), and perhaps those at Gilgal and Beersheba were of the same sort (iv. 4; v. 4 f.). There were, however, others, even at Bethel (iii. 14), some of which must have been erected to the idols at that time worshiped in Israel (v. 26; Hos. x. 1). At all of these, as often as there was a feast, anybody could see the dearest rights of the poor shamelessly disregarded, and this in the name of religion. — **the wine of such as have been fined they drink,** *i.e.* wine purchased with the proceeds of fines. Amos does not say that these fines were unjustly imposed, but the character of the justice that was dispensed in Israel (*v.* 6) was such as to make it almost certain that they were excessive if not totally unmer-

[1] Ewald would change יטו to ידו (Joel iv. 3), and read: *they cast lots for garments taken in pledge.* Oort would drop על, and make בגדים the direct object of יטו. These and other changes in the text have been suggested because scholars have been loth to believe that the same form יטו would be used both transitively and intransitively in so close connection. (Compare *v.* 7.)

ited. The wine thus purchased was an essential of the meal that followed certain offerings (Ex. xxxii. 6; Num. xxv. 2; 1 Sam. x. 3), and the *drunkards of Ephraim* (Isa. v. 11; compare Am. iv. 1) drank it — **in the houses of their gods:** the clause might also be translated, *in the house of their gods* (Orelli), or, *in the house of their God* (Keil). The former of these translations is essentially that of the text; to the latter there are the following objections: 1. Amos represents the true God as dwelling at Jerusalem (i. 2); 2. If he had intended to recognize any other sanctuary as equally the abode of the Almighty, he would probably have used the words *in the house of Jehovah* (Joel i. 9); 3. The phrase is parallel with *beside every altar*, which, taken in connection with iii. 14 and v. 26, is best explained as implying not merely a number of altars, but also a number of divinities. See Oort, *TT* 140.[1]

b. Jehovah's Goodness, vv. 9–12. — 9. **Yet it was I:** an emphatic contrast, not between Jehovah and the helpless idols worshiped by Israel (Orelli), but between Jehovah and ungrateful Israel. It is as if Amos had said (in Jehovah's name), These things ye have done to me, while *I*, on the other hand, etc. The enumeration of the proofs of Jehovah's goodness that follow, thus greatly enhances the apparent turpitude of Israel's conduct. — **the Amorite:** the singular (always) for the plural, like *the Indian* for *the Indians*. The Amorites, according to Gen. x. 15, were one of eleven tribes sprung

[1] The rendering adopted is based on the well-known law, that when a compound conception is to be pluralized it is necessary to give to only one of the members of the compound the plural form (Ges. 124, 2). See 1 Sam. xxxi. 9. The reading of the Septuagint is ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν.

from Canaan. Their original home was in the hills of Southern Palestine (Gen. xiv. 7, 13), but at the time of the Exodus, Amorites were found, not only in this region (Num. xiii. 29; Josh. xi. 3), but in their greatest strength east of the Jordan (Num. xxi. 21). The name Amorite, however, like Canaanite, is often, as here, given to the whole population of the Promised Land (Gen. xv. 16; Josh. xxiv. 15). The Amorites proper were overthrown by Moses before his death (Num. xxi. 21 ff.; Deut. ii. 26 ff.). The complete subjugation of the tribes of Canaan was not accomplished until the reign of David (2 Sam. xxi. 2). — **like the height of cedars:** the stature of the Amorites, or, strictly, Anakites, is described as gigantic also in Hebrew history (Deut. i. 20, 28). It is here compared with the height of the cedar, a tree which, among the Hebrews, was the ideal of grandeur (2 Kings xiv. 19; Isa. ii. 13), as the oak was of strength (Isa. ii. 13; Zech. xi. 2). This picture is calculated to remind the Hebrews that it was really Jehovah and not they themselves who destroyed the Amorites. — **his fruit above and his roots beneath:** there is in these words no reference to different ages or classes among the Amorites (Hitzig). They simply mean *root and branch, completely*. See Eze. xvii. 9; Hos. ix. 16; compare Job xviii. 16; Isa. v. 24.[1]

10. **I myself also brought you up from the land of Egypt:** the order in which these first two examples are cited is not chronological. The Amorites were not destroyed until after the Exodus and the sojourn in the desert; but there is a logical warrant for the actual

[1] The famous inscription on the sarcophagus of the Sidonean king Eshmunazar also contains this expression.

arrangement, since the destruction of the Amorites had to precede the complete occupation of Canaan in which the Exodus resulted. This great deliverance is constantly used as an argument for gratitude and obedience, especially in the Pentateuch. See Ex. xx. 2; also Hos. xi. 1; Mic. vi. 4. The full effect of its application in this case is obtained by the change from the third to the second person. Israel, in their ingratitude, are thus brought face to face with their outraged benefactor.[1] — **and led you in the desert forty years:** the Hebrews were denied a direct entrance into Canaan in punishment for their rebellion against Jehovah (Num. xiv. 26 ff.), yet since, during their wanderings, he never lost sight of them, and finally brought them into the Promised Land, even the great and terrible desert to which they were banished might well be remembered with thankfulness. It was, in fact, only a scene in the great drama of the Exodus. See Deut. xxix. 4. — **to possess the land of the Amorite:** this clause explains, not the result of Jehovah's patience with his people in the desert, but his object in leading them up from Egypt.

11. The Exodus was a manifestation of Jehovah to his people. Moses was the mediator through whom the revelation was effected. When Moses died, Jehovah did not sever his relations with the Hebrews, but continued through other like instruments (Deut. xviii. 15) to make himself and his will known. Therefore he says — **Moreover, I ordained some of your children for prophets:** Israel (in the narrower sense) had been especially favored in this respect; for, besides the prophets who had been sent to the Hebrews as a whole, they had had,

[1] Some MSS. in the preceding verse have מפניכם for מפניהם.

among others, the following: Ahijah (1 Kings xiv. 2), Jehu (1 Kings xvi. 1), Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 1), Elisha (1 Kings xix. 16), Micaiah (1 Kings xxii. 8), Jonah (2 Kings xiv. 25), with two others whose names are not given (1 Kings xiii. 1; xx. 35), and some of these had been among the greatest whom Jehovah ever commissioned. — **and some of your youths for nazirites:** nazirites (not Nazarites) were of two kinds, those separated, devoted, to Jehovah for a limited time (according to the Talmud not less than thirty days), called nazirites of days, and those thus consecrated for life. The law with reference to the former is found Num. vi. 1 ff. The requirements were the same for the latter, as appears from the references to the vows of Samson (Jud. xiii. 5) and Samuel (1 Sam. i. 11), the only nazirites for life mentioned in the Old Testament. There were doubtless others, who, though not like these consecrated to Jehovah from their birth, took upon them the vows of the nazirite in later life. Perhaps that is what is meant by the expression *youths*, which, however, should not be taken too literally. It may be used because the nazirite, even if consecrated from his birth, could not enter upon the service of Jehovah until he was old enough to be called a *youth* (1 Sam. i. 24). The nazirites were teachers, like the prophets, but the lessons which they gave were object lessons.[1] — **Is not this indeed so?** No doubt is implied, but the opposite. The question, therefore, is calculated to force from those addressed a confession which will at the same time be their own condemnation. — **saith Jehovah,** lit. *oracle of Jehovah.* A prophetical

[1] John the Baptist also was a nazirite (Lu. i. 15), and, according to Eusebius (*Hist.* II. 23), so was James the brother of Jesus.

formula, especially frequent in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

12. **ye made the nazirites drink wine:** there is no example illustrating this statement in the extant records of Israel, but the degeneracy of the nation is a sufficient guaranty of its correctness. The sensualists described *vv.* 7 f. would not scruple to rid themselves, even by violence, of the embarrassing example of the nazirite. — **Ye shall not prophesy:** there had been instances enough of this latter offense, *e.g.*, by Jeroboam I. (1 Kings xiii. 4), Jezebel (1 Kings xviii. 4; xix. 2), Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 2), Ahaziah (2 Kings i. 9), and Jehoram (2 Kings vi. 31); and another was very soon added, when Amos himself was ordered to hold his peace or leave the country by Amasiah the priest at Bethel (vii. 13). Thus Israel, that they might be undisturbed in their sins, recklessly severed their relations with him to whom they owed their existence as a people and invited the penalty described in the remainder of the chapter.

c. The Penalty of Ingratitude, vv. 13–16. — 13. **Lo, I:** it is the same person, but the interjection introduces him in a new rôle. Love has given place to wrath, and Israel's benefactor has become their destroyer. What means will he use? There is not much doubt that Amos intended to represent him as threatening an earthquake. This is apparent not only from the phrase, **under you,** referring to the earth, but also from *vv.* 14 ff., where an effect is described that would naturally be produced by such a catastrophe. But what has an earthquake in common with — **a cart full of sheaves?** It is necessary to consider this question, since the verb used in this passage is one that does not occur elsewhere

in the Hebrew scriptures, and, therefore, one whose meaning cannot be determined by ordinary methods. What, then, has an earthquake in common with *a cart full of sheaves?* In the first place, a cart like those with which Amos must have been acquainted, if heavily loaded, would creak and groan under its burden. Some such noise accompanies an earthquake. It is possible, therefore, that Amos meant to say, *I will cause a creaking under you, such as a cart full of sheaves causeth.* At any rate, this is one of the most plausible among the renderings that have been suggested.[1] The characteristic feature of the earthquake, however, is of course the trembling motion from which it derives its name. Now a cart loaded with grain would also cause such a motion, even in the ground over which it was driven, but a more perceptible disturbance in the sheaves with which it was loaded. Hence the warrant for translating: *I will cause a trembling under you such as the cart that is full of sheaves causeth.*[2] It is like Amos to use this homely

[1] It is also one of the oldest of the interpretations attempted. Jerome translates מעיק *stridebo*, and several of the Fathers adopt the corresponding Greek word *τρίζειν*, which is also found in Aquila and the margin of the Codex Barberini. J. D. Michaelis and Justi give to the passage substantially the rendering above suggested. Hoffmann, finally, like Justi, basing his opinion on a meaning of the corresponding Arabic word, renders the verb *creak*, but the whole passage, *Where ye stand will I make you cry out, as the threshing-sledge makes the* [*floor*] *filled with sheaves groan.* Compare Pusey.

[2] The meaning *tremble* or *totter* for עוק is rendered even more plausible by the use made of its derivatives עקה and מועקה, Ps. lv. 4 and lxvi. 11. See, however, Nowack on these passages. Orelli, who adopts this rendering for the verb, regards it as intransitive in the second clause, translating: *I make it sway under you as the wagon sways that is full of sheaves.* Steiner gets the same translation by changing the verb from עוק to פוק. See also Wellhausen, *SV*, V. Gunning is consistent in his rendering of

figure, but he could hardly have chosen one more apt, especially if, as one is tempted to think, he had in mind the motion given to the grain as the cart was driven across the fields or along a country road.[1] His hearers (or readers) doubtless appreciated its fitness, and having themselves, perhaps recently, had experience of the meaning of earthquakes (iv. 11), shuddered as he proceeded.

14. **Then shall refuge fail the swift:** the catastrophe will come so suddenly that even the swiftest of foot will not be able to escape. — **the strong shall not assert** (lit. *strengthen*) **his strength:** he cannot grapple with the force by which the earth is rocked under his feet. — **nor shall the mighty rescue himself:** he whose deeds have made him famous among his fellows will find his strength and courage unavailing.

the verb, but omits לה, and connects the motion in the second clause with the grain, thus: *I make it tremble under you as a full wagon makes the sheaves tremble.*

[1] The verb עוק is more commonly regarded as the Aramaic form of צוק, with the force of *press*, but those who favor this derivation do not agree in their interpretation of the passage. Thus, while some regard the verb as transitive in both clauses, others render it as a transitive in the former and an intransitive in the latter, and still others insist that it is intransitive in both; but whether one translate, *I will press you down* (or *in your place*), *as the wagon presses which is filled with sheaves* (Keil), or, *I will press you down, as a wagon gives way which is full of sheaves* (Maurer), or, finally, *I feel myself* (*am*) *pressed under you, as the wagon feels itself* (*is*) *pressed which is full of sheaves* (Baur), one has to do violence to the text and disregard the requirements of the context. Wetzstein, commenting on Hoffmann's interpretation (*ZAW*, 1883, 278), adds a new one. He renders the passage: *I will cause a stoppage under you as the threshing-wheel* (Isa. xxviii. 27 f.) *stops* (*i.e.* no longer turns) *which is choked with straw*, and quotes the use of the Arabic equivalent of עוק in Syria and Palestine in the sense of *hinder*, to support his view.

15. This verse and the next repeat the statements of the last in a different order and with increased emphasis.[1] — **he who handleth the bow,** perhaps the *strong* of the preceding verse. His arms will be as useless as the strength behind them. He — **shall not stand,** must yield. — **nor shall the swift of foot rescue:** this passage is repeated for the sake of making the following addition.[2] — **nor he who rideth the horse:** the swiftness of neither man nor horse can save one.

16. **the stoutest of heart,**[3] the most stubbornly courageous. — **shall flee:** join the rest in their vain attempt to escape the wrath of Jehovah. — **naked,** defenceless, having lost his courage as well as abandoned his armor. — **in that day** — the day of Jehovah. See v. 18.

This is a terrible picture. How is it to be understood? Did Amos mean to predict a literal earthquake? In favor of this interpretation is the fact that he reckoned such phenomena among the means by which Jehovah had chastised his people (iv. 11); that in another passage (viii. 8) he seems to have expected the occurrence of an earthquake; and, finally, that in the title (i. 1) he is said to have prophesied just before the great earthquake in the days of Uzziah. The conclusion is therefore very natural that Amos foresaw that earthquake, and that it is to be regarded as the fulfillment of this prophecy (Orelli). On the other hand, it must be remembered that this prophecy concerning Israel is one

[1] *V.* 15 is wanting in several manuscripts. The Arabic version also omits it contrary to the authority of the Septuagint.

[2] The object נפשו must be supplied (see Ps. xxix. 1) or the verb יִמָּלֵט itself changed to יְמַלֵּט, the form that the translators of the Septuagint gave it. Hence the reading *διασωθῇ*.

[3] On the construction see Ges.[25] 128, 3.

of a series, in all of the rest of which a symbol for war — fire — is employed; that throughout the remainder of the book war is the means by which Israel are finally to be destroyed (v. 27; vi. 7, 14; vii. 9, 17; xix. 9, 14); and, finally, that in this passage (*v.* 15) mention is made of the bow, as if it might be a figure for arms taken against the threatened danger (Keil). See also *v.* 16. In view of these considerations one might perhaps be justified in interpreting the earthquake predicted figuratively as a convulsion such as that which followed the invasion of Palestine by Tiglath-pileser III. and resulted (in *722* B.C.) in the total overthrow of the northern kingdom by Sargon (2 Kings xv. 29; xvii. 6; Schrader, *KAT* 255 f.; 271 ff.).

II.

THE CASE OF ISRAEL (iii.–vi.).

Amos was not content with convicting Israel of the basest ingratitude toward Jehovah, their God, and condemning them in the general verdict with their neighbors. They seemed to demand, and he gave them, so to speak, a separate trial. The second part of his book is a record of the case.

1. Preliminaries of Justice, iii.

First come certain preliminaries by which the rights of the accused are insured. Thus, *e.g.*, Amos repeats with solemn emphasis —

a. The Substance of the Indictment, vv. 1–2. — 1. **Hear this word** is the solemn formula with which each of the three divisions of this part begins (iv. 1; v. 1). — **chil-**

dren of Israel, or *house of Israel*[1] is a name by which Amos repeatedly addresses the ten tribes of the northern kingdom.[2] In fact, if this be an exception, it is the only passage in which the words are used by him in any other sense. No one, therefore, would think of applying them to the Hebrews as a people in this instance, but for the clause following, especially as in the latter half of the chapter the children of Israel in the narrower sense are plainly intended. Why not suppose that Amos here also addressed the ten tribes, but, remembering that what he was going to say applied to all who had been delivered from bondage, added — **against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt,** and thus made my people (Ex. xv. 16)? This addition (or correction), which is made a part of the divine message by the introduction of the first person, had a twofold force. It reminded Israel proper that any preëminence among the nations of which they might boast was the inheritance of all the sons of Jacob, and it reminded Judah that any danger that threatened Israel threatened them also so far as they had been guilty of similar transgressions.

2. **You only have I chosen,** lit. *known.* This is a doctrine not merely of the Pentateuch (Gen. xii. 1; Ex. xxiv. 8; Deut. xxvi. 16 ff.), but of the entire Old Testament (Hos. xi. 1; Isa. v. 1 ff.; Jer. iii. 1). When, however, it is asserted that Jehovah chose the Hebrews for his people, it is not meant that this choice was arbitrary

[1] The latter, instead of the former phrase, is found in this passage according to the Targum, the Septuagint, and some Hebrew manuscripts.

[2] The form *children of Israel* occurs, outside of this passage, ii. 11, iii. 12, iv. 5, ix. 7; the other, v. 1, 25, vi. 14, vii. 10, ix. 9.

and unconditional, so that when he made it he thereby did injustice to the other peoples. Amos, in this very verse, clearly enough teaches that it had a moral warrant, and that therefore it was valid only so long as the character of the Hebrews themselves justified it. When they lost their faith in Jehovah and neglected his service, they lost their claim to his peculiar favor. See ix. 7. — **therefore:** not, of course, because they were his chosen, but because having been chosen they had proven unworthy of his favor. — **all your iniquities:** the word *all* seems sometimes to have been understood as denoting a contrast between Jehovah's treatment of Israel and his treatment of other nations; as if he had said, the other nations, because I have not shown them especial favor, I will punish less strictly than they deserve; but you, because ye are my people, for *all* your iniquities (Keil). This cannot have been Amos' meaning. One must therefore interpret *all* here as in viii. 7, where it has about the force of *many* (compare v. 12). Israel, like the rest of the nations, were to be punished because they had transgressed *repeatedly*. If their punishment was to be severer, it was not because a larger proportion of their sins was taken into account, but because, in view of the favor that they had received, their sins were more heinous in the eyes of Jehovah.[1]

b. The Prophet's Credentials, vv. 3–8. — The announcement just quoted was not calculated to find ready acceptance. Amos doubtless knew that his authority for making it, or for assuming the prophetic office, would

[1] There is evidently no "particularism" in the passage, and therefore no reason why its genuineness should be questioned as it has been by Oort (*TT*, 1880, 122).

be questioned. The following verses are intended to answer such questions.

3. **Do two walk together except they have joined each other?** *i.e.* for the purpose. All speculation concerning the two intended, whether Joel and Amos, Jehovah and Israel (Marck), Jehovah and Assyria, or Jehovah and the prophet (Orelli), is idle. They are any two persons seen walking together. The natural inference in such a case is that the men have met by agreement for the purpose of making the journey in company, or, in broader terms, that this, like other phenomena, has a cause.

4. **Doth a lion roar:** lions must have been common in Palestine in early times (Jud. xiv. 5; 1 Sam. xvii. 34). They remained a scourge some time after Amos (2 Kings xvii. 25). Johannes Phocas, toward the end of the twelfth century of our era, related that they were still found in the thickets bordering the Jordan (Reland, *Palestina*, I. 274; Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, 247). They have now entirely disappeared from the country. — **when there is no prey for him,** *i.e.* does he go hunting in vain? This interpretation is commended by the fact that it furnishes a contrast to the latter half of the verse, such as is found in each of the next two verses. If it be objected that lions do not roar *before* taking prey (Orelli), it is only necessary to quote Isa. v. 29 and Ps. civ. 21 to show that at least the Hebrews represented them as so doing. The question implies the truth that when a cause has been set in operation one may look for an effect. The rest of the verse presents the correlative truth already found in *v.* 3. — **a young lion** is purely a variation. — **except he have caught**

something: when one hears him, therefore, one infers that he has something (compare Keil).

5. In this verse the order of thought is reversed. — **Doth a bird fall upon the ground,** where the springe with its temptation is placed. The words, **a snare of,** fit so awkwardly into the construction and are so easily explained as an interpolation, that with the Septuagint it seems best to omit them.[1] — **if there be no springe for her,** set to catch her. When, therefore, one sees a bird fall fluttering to the earth, one infers that it has been caught.[2] — **doth a snare fly up from the ground,** as it does when it closes upon a bird. On this subject see Smith, *BD*, art. *Sparrow*. — **and catch nothing at all,** without effect.[3]

6. The order of thought in this verse is the same as in *v.* 4. — **If a trumpet be blown,** by a watchman (Eze. xxxiii. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 8), — **do not the people tremble?** in consequence. — **if evil befall a city,** any misfortune such as famine, pestilence, etc. — **is it not Jehovah who hath wrought it?** The Hebrews took no account of what are called secondary causes. They saw the hand of Jehovah in everything (Isa. xlv. 7). Amos, therefore, here gives expression to a universally accepted doctrine. How he harmonized the occurrence of mis-

[1] A glance at the original will show how easy it was to insert this second פח. The mistake is probably explained by the likeness of על of this sentence to יעלה of the next, in which פח properly occurs. See Gunning.

[2] The word translated *springe* מוקש, if the preceding פח is omitted, must be regarded as a synonym of the one following. It is possible, however, that the text should be further corrected and מוקש be replaced by יוקש, *fowler*, the rendering in which all the ancient versions agree.

[3] For the construction see Ges.[25] 113, 3, *a*.

fortunes with the character of Jehovah will appear in the next chapter (6–11).[1] For the present he merely asserts the relation of cause and effect between Jehovah and misfortunes in general. The mere mention of evil, however, must have suggested to those whom he addressed, that his object was not simply to amuse them, and awakened in them a certain apprehension. The next verse brings him still nearer to the point which he wishes to enforce.

7. **But,** lit. *for,* introduces the application, or rather the explanation that prepares the way for the application, of the preceding illustrations. See Isa. v. 7.[2] — **his purpose,** lit. *his secret;* here his punitive purpose. Compare Ps. xxv. 14. — **his servants, the prophets,** those through whom he manifests himself to men (Gen. xviii. 17; Deut. xviii. 18).

8. Now comes the application proper. — **A lion hath roared:** not the beast of *v.* 4, but he, the effect of whose terrible voice is described i. 2, Jehovah. — **who can but fear?** This voice, however, to the great multitude, is but a roar, an inarticulate menace, giving no reasons and suggesting no remedy. The prophet alone can interpret it. For him — **The Lord Jehovah hath spoken,** revealing the dreadful purpose to which the sins of his children have driven him. This revelation is at the same time a message — **who can but prophesy?** Who

[1] Hoffmann, seemingly because he cannot admit that "all evil or misfortune comes from Jehovah," changes the text of this verse so as to make it read, *If there is a warning* (תְּרוּעָה = רֵעַ = רֵעָה) *by a prophet,* lit. *a watcher* (עֵר), *hath not Jehovah made it?* Must we then coin Hebrew words (רֵעָה) to save the credit even of a prophet? See Gunning.

[2] The suggestion of Oort (*TT,* 1880, 135), therefore, that כִּי be changed to כֹּה is unnecessary.

am I that I should refuse to deliver the message (Eze. xxxiii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 16)? It is perfectly clear from this passage that Amos claimed to be a prophet, *i.e.* a messenger of Jehovah, and it is equally clear from his whole book that he *was* a prophet. When, therefore (vii. 14 f.), he said that he was not a prophet, he cannot have meant what his words at first sight would seem to express.

c. The Approval of the Heathen, vv. 9–15. — The prophet, with rare skill, further prepares the way for the severe judgments that he has to announce by summoning the heathen to witness the sins of Samaria and afterwards, in brief terms, as if with their approval, condemning the nation to destruction.

SAMARIA'S CORRUPTION, *vv.* 9–10. — 9. **Proclaim ye:** the speaker is Jehovah; this seems clear from *v.* 10; but it is difficult to determine who are addressed. It can hardly be Israel, for they would not be required to call witnesses to their own guilt; nor is it probable that the heathen themselves are the subject (Baur), since they are not yet present to the speaker. A favorite opinion is that the prophets are addressed (Keil); but to this interpretation there are the objections, that Amos, to judge from his book, seems to have stood alone in his office, and that he would hardly have represented himself as sent on a mission to the heathen. Compare chapters i. and ii. It seems most natural, therefore, to regard the subject as indefinite, any one who might hear the message, and could deliver it. — **over the palaces:** it is the wealthy and noble of Samaria who are the curse of their people, hence it is fitting that those in whose presence they are to be condemned

should also come from palaces, — a jury of their peers.[1] — **in Ashdod,** as a part of Philistia. The idea is that the condition of Israel is corrupt enough to offend even a Philistine.[2] — **the mountains of Samaria,** *i.e.* round about Samaria, for Samaria was situated on an isolated hill surrounded on every side by higher ones from which it could be overlooked (Robinson, *Res.* II. 304). The city was founded by Omri, who made it the capital of his kingdom (1 Kings xvi. 24). It was further adorned and fortified by his successors, especially Ahab, who, besides his "ivory palace" (1 Kings xxii. 39), built there a temple to Baal (1 Kings xvi. 32). It withstood at least two sieges, escaping, however, only by the intervention of Jehovah (1 Kings xx. 13; 2 Kings vii. 1). When, therefore, Jehovah deserted Israel, their capital, after a siege of three years, in 722 B.C. fell before the Assyrians (2 Kings xvii. 5 f.). Its further history is of little interest until one reaches the Christian era. About this time Herod the Great rebuilt the city and changed its name to Sebaste in honor of Augustus. Even he could not procure for it a lasting importance. It is now a mere village, called Sebastiyeh, on the eastern end of the hill, which it once covered, and which is still strewn with the ruins of its former magnificence.[3] — **and see,** what one could not help see-

[1] The preposition על might also be rendered *on*. The palaces would then most naturally be thought of as buildings from whose roofs the inhabitants of the neighborhood could best be made to hear. See Matt. x. 27 (Pusey). According to the Masora this is one of the thirteen passages in which על = אל. See also the Septuagint.

[2] The Septuagint has Ἀσσυρίοις, *i.e.* the translators mistook אשדוד for אשור, which is more excusable than most of their errors.

[3] Oort (*TT*, 1880, 120), following the Septuagint, reads הר for הרי, as in iv. 1 and vi. 1, and thus brings the heathen into the city of Samaria. So also Wellhausen (*SV*, V.).

ing. — **the manifold uproar,** lit. *uproars*, repeated outbreaks of confusion, the result of the violence of the ruling classes.[1] — **oppression,** lit. *oppressions* or *oppressed*, before which the adjective *manifold* is to be understood.[2]

10. **they know not how to do right:** they, the Samaritans, or the wealthy among them, have so long and so often done wrong that it has become a second nature to them. — **violence and oppression,** *i.e.* riches obtained by violence and oppression. — **in their palaces** shows what class in Israel Amos meant to arraign. See *v.* 11.

JEHOVAH'S PURPOSE, *vv.* 11–12. — The prophet, this time without referring to the consideration that he emphasized ii. 9–11 (which would have been out of place in the presence of the witnesses summoned), proceeds to declare Jehovah's purpose concerning Israel.

11. **A foe:** a purposely abrupt and startling announcement.[3] — **even round about the land:** so that whichever way the startled sinner may look he will see no hope of escape.[4] — **he shall strip thee of thy strength,** lit. *bring down thy strength*, thy walls and citadel.[5] — **thy palaces**

[1] On the use of the plural of abstract nouns to denote a condition or characteristic finding frequent expression, see Ges.[25] 124, 1, *b*. The addition of רבות makes more clear the force of the construction.

[2] Jerome, following his Jewish teachers, translates עשוקים as a Pass. Part. *calumniam patientes*.

[3] The word צר might also be rendered *trouble*, and it is perhaps most frequently interpreted as an abstract noun with some such signification (Baur), but, if it is thus rendered, the following verb והוריד is left without so natural a subject as this word furnishes. Compare the Septuagint.

[4] The fact that סביב is elsewhere always followed by ל has led to the suggestion that it be regarded as a substantive (Ewald), or that the text be changed from וסביב to יסביב (Baur), or וסובב (Gunning, Wellhausen). The Peshita has a verb. For the construction of ו see Ges. 154, n. *b*.

[5] For והוריד Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) reads והורד.

shall be plundered: thus they will be emptied, as they were filled, by violence. See *v.* 10.[1]

12. Here follows one of Amos' characteristic compressions. — **two legs or a bit of an ear:** when a lion attacked the flock of David, the young shepherd was able to kill the beast and rescue the stolen lamb from its jaws (1 Sam. xviii. 34 f.). The Hebrews were not always so fortunate. Sometimes they came too late to save anything but the veriest remnant of a sheep or goat, the fleshless ends of a couple of its legs, or only a bit of one of its ears. — **the children of Israel:** not the Hebrew people, or even the kingdom of Israel as a whole, but those who in *v.* 9 were described as robbers, and are now represented as voluptuaries. It is, therefore, incorrect to find any reference to the remnant to whom Amos promised mercy (ix. 9), and whose fortunes Isaiah (vi. 13) loved to picture (Baur). The idea is that these sinners are to be destroyed almost to a man. — **in the corner of a couch:** the most comfortable part of the low settle running along three sides of an oriental room, and the seat of honor (Van Lennep, *BL* 460). — **in the damask of a divan:** the silken stuff with which the above-described settle was upholstered, so named for Damascus, where it was manufactured. Compare *muslin* from Mosul, *hollands* from Holland, etc. See 1 Kings xx. 34.[2]

[1] On the form נִבְזוּ see Ges. 67, R 5.

[2] The above seems the only reasonable interpretation of the passage. Like Pusey (who follows Jerome) to insist on rendering דַּמֶּשֶׂק Damascus is to introduce a difficulty for which there is no necessity. Hoffmann adopts the same translation, but he begins a new sentence with הַיֹּשְׁבִים, and introduces a second בִּפְעַת, thus getting: *Ye who sit in Samaria in bed corners, and in Damascus in sofa* [*corners*], *hear me*, etc. Wellhausen

The last two verses were a natural outbreak of the divine wrath, in view of Israel's corruption. The three following are a more deliberate and definite statement of Jehovah's purpose.

A PROCLAMATION, *vv.* 13–15. — 13. **Hear ye:** the heathen nobles of Egypt and Philistia were summoned (*v.* 9) to witness the guilt of Israel. It is natural to expect them to be heard in the matter. Perhaps, therefore, Amos intended to represent them as commissioned by Jehovah to declare to his people the fate that they deserved (Hitzig). If this seems too dramatic, the subject must be supposed to be the same as in *v.* 9. Neither Israel (Baur) nor the prophets (Gunning) can well be the persons addressed. — **declare unto:** formally and solemnly announce (Gen. xliii. 3). — **the house of Jacob:** *Jacob* is used by Amos, as by the other prophets, as the equivalent of *Israel* (ix. 8 f.). *The house of Jacob* might, therefore, denote either the entire family of Jacob (iii. 1), or only the ten tribes of the northern kingdom. Its meaning in this passage is indicated by the mention of Bethel. It is Israel in the narrower sense who are to be warned. Compare Keil. — **the Lord Jehovah, the God of hosts,** is an accumulation of divine names, intended to add solemnity to the announcement. See iv. 13; v. 16, 27; vi. 14. The same series is not found elsewhere in the book (comp. v. 16), or, indeed, in the Old Testament. Jeremiah is the only other prophet who is given to multiplying the names of God in this way. See Jer. xxxii. 18; xliv. 7.

supposes one or more words to have been omitted after דמשק. It is equally unnatural to connect "ונ בפעת with ינצלו instead of הישבים, and translate *with the corner of a couch*, etc. (Gunning). It is Israel themselves, rather than their goods, who are threatened with destruction. See Baur.

14. **that,** not *for* (R.V.) nor *surely* (Henderson) — **when I punish Israel,** as already threatened (*vv.* 11 f.). — **the altars of Bethel:** even the one at which the people vainly imagined that they were worshiping Jehovah (ix. 1).[1] These altars are mentioned because they were the center of the false worship of Israel (1 Kings xii. 29; Am. vii. 13), and especially sacred on account of the prominence of Bethel in the history of the patriarchs. There Abraham had built an altar (Gen. xii. 8), and Jacob another (Gen. xxxv. 7), and there their posterity had ever since worshiped (1 Sam. x. 3). The destruction of the altars of Bethel, therefore, meant nothing short of the total overthow of the religion of Israel. — **the horns of the altar:** not any particular altar, as, *e.g.*, that built by Jeroboam to the golden calf (Pusey), but any and every altar; as one would say, *the altar-horns*. These horns were not mere ornaments, but an essential feature of the altar, for without them certain ceremonies connected with sacrifices could not be performed (Lev. iv. 30). When these were removed, therefore, the altar would be practically destroyed and worship rendered impossible. Moreover, with the destruction of their altars the last refuge of the people would disappear (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 28).[2]

15. **the winter house together with the summer house:** the winter house was probably not generally a structure distinct from the summer house (Van Lennep, *BL* 115), but a part of the same structure. According to

[1] It seems certain from ii. 8, that there were more altars than one at Bethel, hence it is not necessary with Oort (*TT*, 1880, 142) to change the text, substituting מצבת for מזבחות.

[2] Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) rejects 14 *b* as an interpolation that disturbs the connection.

Thomson (*LB*, II. 250) the lower apartments, if there are two stories, or the interior, if there is but one, are still the ones occupied by Orientals in winter, while the upper or exterior rooms are preferred for summer. See Jud. iii. 20; Jer. xxxvi. 22. These houses were of course the houses of the wealthy, including, perhaps, the palace of the king. They must, therefore, have been in Samaria. There also were — **the houses of ivory,** *i.e.* houses richly ornamented with this material. Ahab had such a house (1 Kings xxii. 39), and his example was doubtless imitated by those of these later times who could afford them. See vi. 4 — **many houses shall disappear,** the many houses of which the rich have obtained possession. Isa. v. 8 f.[1]

2. The Depth of Israel's Guilt, iv.

The guilt of Israel is evident enough from the preceding chapter, but the extent of it is more apparent from the one that now follows. Two illustrations are given.

a. The Reckless Sensuality of the Women, vv. 1–3. — Amos has already accused the wealthy in Israel as a class of pampering their lusts at the expense of the poor and lowly (ii. 8). Now it appears that the men were instigated by the women to such outrages. What stronger evidence of utter corruption could be demanded?

1. **Hear this word:** see iv. 1; v. 1. — **kine of Bashan:** Bashan was the elevated region east of the Sea of Galilee, famous, like Carmel, in ancient times for its fertility

[1] The translation *great* for *many* (Henderson) would fit the context, but רבים is not so rendered. See v. 12. The Septuagint adds ἕτεροι.

(Isa. xxxiii. 9); famous also for the flocks and herds for which it furnished pasturage. The Psalmist (xxii. 12 f.) called his enemies *bulls of Bashan*, and Amos could hardly have found a better name than *cows of Bashan* for the wanton and wicked women of Samaria. Were they not in their excesses a constant source of terror to the *lowly* and *needy*?[1] — **who oppress the lowly,** not perhaps directly, but indirectly through their husbands. — **their lords,** their husbands (Gen. xviii. 12), who are only too willing to be the instruments of their wives' cruelty.[2] — **Fetch for us to drink:** each wife thus addresses her husband, at the same time inviting him to the feast for which he is to provide the materials. This is a dark picture, but its correctness is confirmed by Isaiah, who is no less severe than Amos against *the drunkards of Ephraim* (xxviii. 1 ff.).

2. **by his holiness:** by his sacred, awe-inspiring per-

[1] Jerome, following the Targum, interpreted *kine of Bashan* as a contemptuous characterization of the effeminate nobility of the northern kingdom, and his interpretation has been adopted by many scholars. It finds some support in the fact that Amos nowhere else addresses himself to women, and in the further consideration that he here repeatedly lapses into masculine forms, *e.g.* אדניהם, עליכם, אתכם. See also שמעו. Hos. x. 11 has been quoted as containing a parallel to this supposed figure. On the other hand, it is to be noted, that the *heifer* in Hos. x. 11, is a substitute for a female figure, that of Jehovah's wife (ii. 2), for Israel, that the use of masculine for feminine forms is by no means infrequent (Ges. 121, 6, R 1; 147), and that, on the supposition that women are really addressed, the passage is no more abrupt than Isa. iii. 16 ff. concerning the application of which there can be no doubt. Compare Pusey. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) simply declares the masculine mistakes for the feminine suffixes.

[2] The word אדניהם might be rendered *their lord, viz.* the king, and it must be so rendered and referred to the king if Jerome's interpretation be adopted.

sonality; by himself (vi. 8; compare Gen. xxii. 16). — **ye shall be taken with hooks:** the figure is changed. The women of Samaria are no longer fat cattle, terrifying the beholder with their fierce wantonness, but helpless fishes at the mercy of every angler (Hab. i. 14 f.). This last figure may have been suggested by the practice among the Assyrians, and perhaps other nations, of leading captives by ropes attached to hooks or rings in the under lip (Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, I. 243). See 2 Kings xix. 28; Isa. xxxvii. 29.[1] — **the last of you,** so that none will be left.[2]

3. **ye shall go forth:** not as fugitives (Hitzig), but as captives. Both figures have now been abandoned. — **through the breaches,** made by their besiegers. These breaches will be so many that it will not be necessary to look for a gate. They can be led forth — **each one straight forward,** from the place where she is captured. — **and be driven toward Harmon:** this is probably a correct translation of the better text of the original. It is unsatisfactory, because, after centuries of research, no one has yet been able, with any degree of certainty, to identify Harmon with any known place or country. All that can be asserted with any confidence is that, if the text is correct, Harmon must have been the name

[1] נשא might be either a Niphal or a Piel form, but it is probably the latter with an indefinite subject (Ges.[25] 144, 3, *a*), unless (Wellhausen *SV*, V.) it is a mistake for נשאו. צנות (like סירות), the fem. plur., elsewhere always has a different meaning; hence, the error of the early translators and commentators who rendered it *shields*. They translated סירות *pots*, though the addition of דוגה ought to have prevented such a mistake. See the Septuagint.

[2] The translation *your posterity* (Hitzig) is inadmissible, since Amos plainly expected a complete and *speedy* destruction (vii. 17).

of a place or country, and, if it was either of these, it must have lain in the direction of Assyria (v. 27).[1]

b. The Obstinate Hypocrisy of the Nation, vv. 4–13. — In his first complaint (ii. 6 ff.) Amos gave Israel credit for being "very religious," but he told them distinctly enough that a religion without justice, to say nothing of mercy, was a delusion. In the following verses he accuses them of persisting in their error in spite of the chastisements by which Jehovah had sought to correct them.

[1] The form השלכתנה is, except in one manuscript, pointed as an active, but the difficulty of rendering it in this way has led many, following the Septuagint and other ancient versions, to translate it as a passive. The ה at the end is explained as an addition occasioned by the influence of תצאנה. Compare Ges. 44, 2, R 4. The amount of ingenuity that has been expended on ההרמונה is something remarkable. It has been identified with the proper names Armenia (Jerome) and Harmonia (Movers). It has been rendered by several appellatives: *palace*, like ארמון (Kimchi); *pride* (Jarchi); *highlands* (Hesselberg); *butcher's block* (Döderlein); and *place of misfortune* (Dahl). It has been separated into two words; and rendered *mount Monah* (Theodotion); *the highlands of Armenia* for ההר מני, see Jer. li. 27 (Bochart); and *to the mountain as a refuge*, for ההר מעונה (Hitzig). It has been slightly changed and identified with *Hermon*, ההרמונה, which is actually the reading of one manuscript (Vater); and the idol *Rimmon* or *Rimmonah*, הרמונה (Orelli). Finally, it has been explained as a mistake for ההר רמונה (see the Septuagint), *the mountain to Rimmon*, see Jud. xx. 45 (Böttcher), or *on the mountain* (ye shall cast) *Rimmonah* (Ewald); הדד רמין, *Hadad-rimmon*, a Syrian idol (Baur); or הדד רמונה, to *Hadadrimmon*, a place near Samaria (Steiner). Of the oldest versions, the Vulgate has *Armenia;* the Targum and the Peshita, *the mountains of Armenia;* but the Septuagint, *mount Romman* (A, Remman). In view of the variety of opinion that this review discloses, it would seem unnecessary to add another interpretation; but it seems strange that no one, on the basis of the rendering found in the Septuagint, has suggested הרה רמון, *toward the highlands of Ramman; i.e.* Syria. See v. 27. Perhaps it were better, with Wellhausen (*SV*, V.), to regard the text as hopelessly corrupt.

FALSE ZEAL, *vv.* 4–5. — First he ridicules their false zeal. 4. **Come to Bethel:** the words are in form a summons or an invitation. If Amos ever actually used them, he probably uttered them in a tone that made his hearers for a moment think that he was exhorting them to repair to the most sacred of all their shrines for some religious observance. They soon saw their mistake; for, after a significant pause, he added, in a tone whose irony was perfectly apparent — **and transgress:** the meaning is that the worship at Bethel is not only of no value, but positively offensive in the eyes of Jehovah, so that those who take part in it, by so doing, transgress against him. Amos does not give any reason for this implied assertion, but one can learn from this passage what was not, and from others what was, in his mind, the principal cause of Jehovah's displeasure. He certainly did not condemn the worship at Bethel because Jehovah was not worshiped. The tithes and offerings due him seem to have been paid with remarkable punctuality. He condemned it principally, as appears from ii. 6–9, on account of the moral unfitness of the worshipers. They transgressed, not in coming to Bethel, but in coming as greedy and cruel sensualists (Prov. xxi. 27). — **to Gilgal:** the place, just east of Jericho, where the Hebrews first encamped after crossing the Jordan (Josh. iv. 19). There they deposited the twelve stones taken from the bed of the Jordan (iv. 20); there they revived the neglected rite of circumcision (Josh. v. 3); and there they kept their first passover in the land of promise (Josh. v. 10). After the conquest of Palestine and the removal of the ark to Shiloh, Gilgal remained a favorite sanctuary (1 Sam. x. 8). There Samuel held

his court (1 Sam. vii. 16); there the people ratified the choice of Saul as their first king (1 Sam. xi. 14); and there the king and the prophet met for the last time (1 Sam. xv. 10 ff.). Jeroboam I. doubtless took advantage of the sanctity of the place and made it also help to wean his people from the worship at Jerusalem; for Hosea, like Amos, mentions it in connection with Bethel (v. 5; Hos. iv. 15). The site of Gilgal, long unknown, was discovered in 1865 by the rector of the Austrian Hospice at Jerusalem. For a description of it see Conder, *Tent Work*, II. 7 ff. — **add transgression to transgression,** lit. *multiply to transgress*, *i.e.* the more altars ye visit, the more offensive to Jehovah ye become. — **every morning,** as at the annual feast; for the sacrifices here meant are not regular daily sacrifices, such as were offered in the temple at Jerusalem, and probably also at Bethel (Justi); there would be no irony in such a demand; but the annual sacrifices, to which there are frequent references in the historical books (1 Sam. i. 3, 7, 21). Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) suggests *in the morning*, *i.e. on the morrow*, after the arrival of the worshiper at the sanctuary. The exhortation proceeds in the same tone. Amos urges Israel to bring their tithes, — **every three days** (Wellhausen, *SV*, V., *after three days*), instead of every year, as it was doubtless their custom to do. The tithe thus brought corresponded to the tithe of Deuteronomy (xiv. 28), which, however, once in three years was distributed to the poor at home, instead of being enjoyed, as this seems to have been, at the sanctuary. It is probable that in Israel this was the only tithe ever required. Compare Deut. xxvi. 12.[1]

[1] The translation *every three years* (Henderson), though defensible on

5. **and burn of leavened bread a thank-offering:** leavened bread was a part of the thank-offering as described in the Pentateuch (Lev. vii. 13), but not the part that was burned on the altar (Lev. vii. 14), for nothing leavened could be thus offered to Jehovah (Ex. xxiii. 18). If, as may be supposed, the same regulation was usually observed at Bethel (compare Baur), the act suggested was simply a display of lawless zeal. It is as if Amos had said: When ye bring your thank-offering, burn, not a part, but the whole of it. See Duhm, *TP* 113. Compare W. Robertson Smith, *The O. T. in the Jewish Church*, 341; also Wellhausen, *SV*, V.[1] — **proclaim free-will-offerings:** not in the sense of requiring them (Keil), but in the sense of publishing them, after the self-righteous fashion of the Pharisees of later times (Matt. vi. 2; xxiii. 5), as the next sentence clearly indicates. See Wellhausen, *SV*, V. — **thus ye love to do** (Jer. v. 3–11), *viz.* substitute the externals for the essentials of religion. The same tendency is condemned v. 21 ff., whence also the list of offerings presented at the sanctuary at Bethel may be considerably enlarged. The two passages taken together show that there was, at the time of Amos, even in the northern kingdom, a thoroughly organized and comparatively elaborate cultus.

UNHEEDED CHASTISEMENTS, *vv.* 6–11. — The chastise-

purely lexical grounds (Jud. xvii. 10; 2 Chron. xxi. 19), must be rejected as pointless; so also that of Oort (*TT*, 1880, 143 f.), who renders the whole passage as follows: *Bring in the morning your offerings and on three days* (*viz.* at the time of the three great feasts, which, he claims, originally lasted each a single day) *your tithes.* See Gunning.

[1] On קטר see Ges. 113, 4, *a*. For מחמץ the Targum has the equivalent of מחמם, a reading which is preferred by some commentators (Dahl). Oort translates this word *without leaven.* Compare the Septuagint.

ments enumerated are five in number. They are probably not all that Israel had suffered. Perhaps they are not mentioned in the order in which they were inflicted. The prominent thought is expressed in the refrain with which the description of each closes. They were all alike unsuccessful.

6. **Yet it was I:** there is the same contrast here as in ii. 9, the contrast between a living God and a faithless people. — **nothing to eat,** lit. *cleanness of teeth* (Prov. xiv. 4). — **in all your cities:** throughout the kingdom. Famine had not been an infrequent experience in Israel when Amos prophesied. Two prolonged periods of dearth since the rupture with Judah are mentioned, one of three years under Ahab (1 Kings xvii. 12), and one of seven years under Jehoram (2 Kings iv. 38; viii. 1). The latter of these was severe enough to answer Amos' description, and perhaps recent enough to be remembered by the oldest of his auditors. They had, however, without doubt more recently, if not so severely, suffered in the same way; yet Jehovah is constrained to say, and there is a world of pathetic tenderness in the words, — **ye did not return unto me:** to whom they still belonged and from whom they might have received all that they so sadly lacked.

7. **it was I who withheld from you the rain:** the famine during the reign of Ahab was caused by a prolonged drought (1 Kings xvii. 1), but there must have been later ones that had been the result of other causes (Joel i. 11). It was proper, therefore, to present the two as separate chastisements. For a fuller description of the effects of drought in Palestine see Joel i. 14 ff. — **while yet there were three months:** harvest, then as

now, came at different times for different grains and different parts of the country. It began with the barley as early as the first of April in the valley of the Jordan, but as late as the first of May in some parts of the hills, and lasted about six weeks. Three months before harvest would perhaps be about the first of March for the climate of most of Palestine. At that time the grain would have begun to grow. If, therefore, the rain, which might still be expected to fall at intervals for several weeks (Joel ii. 23), called *the latter rain*, because it was the last of the rainy season, were withheld, the crop would be seriously damaged if not totally destroyed.[1] — **made it rain:** at intervals, as water was required.[2] This is another case, a second display of the power of Jehovah over nature, and a better test of that power than the universal drought just mentioned. — **another city,** lit. *one city.* There may have been some reason in the character of the inhabitants

[1] The following table showing the average rainfall about Jerusalem for twenty-two years (1860–1882) furnishes a correct idea of the duration and character of the rainy season in Palestine: —

Months	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.
Rainy Days	1.50	5.31	9.04	10.28	10.43	8.51	5.45	1.59
Ins. of Rain	0.514	1.664	4.718	5.479	5.207	3.531	1.448	0.199

From this table it is clear that the early and latter rains were not confined to distinct periods with definite limits, but were, as above suggested, simply the welcome showers with which the rainy season gradually began and ended. See Rev. Edwin W. Rice in the *Journal of the Exegetical Society*, for June, 1886, and for a more complete description of the climate of Palestine (more exactly, Jerusalem) Chaplin in the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund for 1883, revised by Kersten for *ZDPV*, XIV. 93 ff.

[2] The verb has the force of a frequentative. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, 114.

of various cities and districts why one should receive rain and another be denied it (Pusey), but Amos does not hint at any such distinction. He simply refers a phenomenon still of frequent occurrence in Palestine (Thomson, *LB*, II. 340) to Jehovah and gives to it a punitive significance. Compare Jud. vi. 36 ff. — **did not make it rain**, *i.e.* in effect, *caused it not to rain.* — **one field:** the same partiality that had been noticed in the cities appeared also in the surrounding country. — **whereupon I did not make it rain:** or, *whereupon it did not rain.* The correctness of the text is in dispute.[1]

8. **two or three cities** that had been denied rain — **staggered,** so weak were they from thirst — **to another city,** lit. *one city,* that had been blessed with rain. — **they were not satisfied,** could not get enough to drink, because the supply in this last city, which was probably stored in pools and cisterns, was not large enough for so many people.

9. **I smote you,** more exactly *your fields* or *your crops.* — **blight and decay,** the singed and bleached condition produced especially by the *east wind* (Gen. xli. 6) or simoom, which has always been, and still is, greatly dreaded by the inhabitants of Palestine. See Robinson, *Res.* I. 287; Van Lennep, *BL* 238. Sometimes, instead of the fields it was the gardens and orchards that suffered; or, when the simoom had done its part, another agent of Jehovah completed the work of destruction. — **your many gardens:** there is a degree of emphasis on the multitude of these gardens that makes

[1] The latter is the translation favored by most commentators (Hitzig). תמטיר, however, is probably an error for אמטיר, a reading that is supported by the Septuagint and other versions. See Ges.[25] 144, 2, R.

the words nearly equivalent to *many as were your gardens*, with a pronoun supplied as the object of the verb.[1] — **the locust,** lit. *the devourer.* The ravages of the locust have often been described by oriental travelers (Thomson, *LB*, II. 295 ff.; Van Lennep, *BL* 313), but never by any one more graphically than by the prophet Joel, who himself seems to have witnessed such a visitation (i. 4 ff.; ii. 1 ff.). Israel had doubtless more than once suffered. — **but ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah:** Hag. ii. 17 is partly copied from this verse.

10. **the pestilence, after the manner of Egypt:** literally translated, the last words read *in the way of Egypt.* Hence they have been interpreted as meaning *on the way to Egypt* (Jarchi), or *by way of Egypt* (Dahl), but most exegetes prefer the rendering above given and find in them either a description of the pestilence as peculiarly Egyptian, or a reference to the plague by which Jehovah destroyed, first the cattle (Ex. ix. 3), and then the people, of Egypt (Ex. xii. 29). See Isa. x. 24, 26. The pestilence was regarded by the Hebrews as one of the most dreadful instrumentalities by which sin was punished (Lev. xxvi. 25; 2 Sam. xxiv. 15). — **I slew,** *i.e.* caused to be slain in war. — **with your captured horses:** *with the captivity of your horses* would be more

[1] The translation *many of your gardens, i.e. a*, instead of *the, multitude of your gardens*, though grammatically admissible, does not do justice to the greedy instincts of the locust. *Much*, modifying the preceding (Henderson), or *often*, qualifying the following verb (Orelli), on the other hand, is an inadmissible translation, since it ignores the distinction between the two forms of the Infinitive. Compare the Septuagint. Very attractive is the emendation suggested by Wellhausen (*SV*, V.), who proposes to change הרבות to הֶחֱרַבְתִּי, and translate, *I laid waste your gardens and vineyards, your fig and olive trees the locust devoured*, etc.

literal, but it would be ambiguous. The meaning is not that, in addition to the slaughter of the youths, the horses were captured (Orelli), but that in addition to the youths the horses captured were also slaughtered, as they seem to have been by Hazael (2 Kings xiii. 7).[1] — **your camp,** after defeat in battle (Isa. xxxiv. 3). — **into your very noses:** this stench would cause a pestilence, but Amos does not mean to suggest any connection between it and the plague previously mentioned. In his eyes the two were distinct inflictions to be referred directly to Jehovah. See *vv.* 6 f.

11. This verse is not a summary of the results of all the foregoing chastisements (Baur), or of the Syrian wars already mentioned (Keil), but a distinct member of the series which it closes. — **I overthrew,** then, can hardly refer to anything but an earthquake; not necessarily the one mentioned in i. 1, but any similar catastrophe by which Israel had been visited. — **some of you,** not as individuals, else there would have been no fitness in the comparison with Sodom and Gomorrah, but as cities and communities. — **as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah:** this is a favorite illustration with Hebrew writers. It is used, however (Deut. xxix. 22; Isa. i. 7;[2] xiii. 19; Jer. xlix. 18; l. 40), not to describe the manner so much as the degree of a threatened calamity. Amos, therefore, in this case, intends to say that some of the cities of Israel had been as completely desolated as were Sodom and Gomorrah after the storm of divine wrath had swept over them (Gen. xix. 25).[3] — **and ye,** *i.e.* those

[1] If שבי be taken in this concrete sense, there is no need of supposing it to be a mistake for צבי (Graetz) or שָׁבֶי (Hoffmann).

[2] In this passage, for זרים read סדום with Ewald, Cheyne, and others.

[3] On the construction of את־סדם, see Ges.[25] 115, 1, R 3.

who were spared by this, if not the last, the most dreadful of the calamities enumerated, after *some* had perished. — **a brand snatched from the blaze:** they were rescued, when hopeless, as by a miracle (Zech. iii. 2 ; Isa. i. 9). Even after having thus been brought face to face with utter destruction Israel did not repent. — **ye did not return unto me, saith Jehovah,** for the fifth and last time. Then suddenly the tone of the prophecy changes.

BEFORE JEHOVAH, *vv.* 12–13. — The patience of Jehovah is exhausted.

12. **Therefore:** because they have failed to profit by the chastisements intended to restore them to his favor. — **thus** points, not backward, threatening the whole nation with the fate of the women (*vv.* 2 f.), but forward to a sentence to be pronounced. Since, however, this sentence is not actually pronounced, the word suggests an indescribable penalty.[1] — **unto thee:** the use of the singular instead of the plural in this passage has the effect of isolating the sinners in Israel and bringing them individually into the presence of Jehovah. — **this,** that which was just threatened but not revealed. — **prepare to meet thy God:** this is not an exhortation to repentance (Justi). Jehovah no longer expects Israel to repent. Have they not ignored the several chastisements? It is rather a challenge, meaning, Ye have resisted my love and mercy; now prepare to endure my anger. The following verse makes this challenge seem little short of mockery.

13. **But,** remember! — **who formeth mountains,** by

[1] Compare the use of כֹּה in the expression, *God do so to me*, etc. (1 Kings ii. 23).

whose power the visible world, with all its grandeur, exists (Ps. civ. 8). — **createth the wind,** and all the rest of the unseen but mighty forces of nature.[1] — **telleth man what is his thought:** since the greatness of Jehovah is evidently the idea to be made prominent, it is best to interpret *his thought* as the thought, not of Jehovah (Dahl), but of man, the secret purpose hidden from human sight. This, while it is hardly formed, Jehovah sees and reveals to his startled creature.[2] See Ps. cxxxix. 2. The three statements already quoted form a series complete in themselves describing the power of Jehovah. The two remaining, which also belong together, seem intended to describe the same dread Being as he comes to punish Israel. If this be the case — **who maketh dawn darkness** is to be explained as referring, not to the gradual change from day to night (Gunning), or *vice versa* (Orelli), but to the sudden darkening of the heavens at the approach of Jehovah in a storm (Ps. xviii. 9).[3] — **walketh on the heights of the earth,** in the clouds by which he is enveloped (Ps. xviii. 10 f.; Mic. i. 3).[4] — **Jehovah the God of hosts:** see iii. 13.[5]

[1] The translation *spirit* (Orelli) has less to recommend it than the one given.

[2] The versions vary so widely from the text, and from one another, that they ought to be quoted. The Septuagint for *what is his thought* has *his Messiah*, the Targum *what are his works*, the Peshita *how great is his glory*, and the Vulgate *his declaration*. Stranger than any of these is the rendering that Hoffmann has suggested, *who poureth the waters of Sihor* (*the Nile*) *over the ground, i.e.* מגיר לאדמה מי שחר.

[3] The reading שחר ועיפה, found in many manuscripts, and reproduced in the Septuagint, is but an attempt to harmonize this passage with v. 8. The hypothesis that there is here a case of asyndeton (Keil) is another attempt in the same direction.

[4] On the form במתי see Ges. 87, 5, R 1; 95, R 2.

[5] On the genuineness of this passage see Introductory Studies III.

3. The Unwilling Severity of Jehovah, v.–vi.

The last chapter closed with a vision of Jehovah coming in his might in the clouds to avenge himself upon his guilty people. The whole tone of the prophecy is now suddenly changed, and the last division of this part of the book presents

a. A Possibility of Mercy, vv. 1–6. — This is suggested by the tenderness of

A lament, *vv.* 1–3, in which the overthrow of Israel, though still delayed, is represented as completed.

1. **Hear this word:** see iii. 1; iv. 1. — **a lament,** a plaintive composition, such as was sung over the dead (2 Sam. i. 17) or on the occasion of any calamity (Eze. xix. 1). The book of Lamentations is a series of such compositions. This one has the proper form of elegiac poetry in Hebrew, being composed of (poetical) verses in each of which a long line is followed by a short one (Budde, *ZAW*, 1882, 1 ff.).

2. **Fallen,** not literally, but to the prophet's vision.[1] — **virgin Israel:** *maid Israel* would perhaps be a better translation, since there is no hint of such a doctrine as the inviolability of Israel (Keil) to be found in the expression. The nation is simply personified as a young woman sorely wounded, by what means or under what circumstances it does not appear, and left to die forgotten where she has fallen. The original application of the name Israel is ignored.[2]

[1] It would seem impossible for anybody to mistake the meaning of the Perfect in this case, yet Oort (*TT*, 1880, 118) takes it literally and on the basis of this interpretation, since, of course, Israel had not been overthrown in the reign of Jeroboam II., rejects the first three verses of this chapter as an interpolation.

[2] The word *daughter* is more frequent than *virgin* in personifications

3. **The city that goeth forth,** to war.

This lament in itself indicates that though they have grievously sinned against Jehovah, there is still mercy for Israel. Restoration to favor is distinctly offered in AN EXHORTATION, *vv.* 4–6, into which the prophet now passes.

4. **But** this dreadful doom may be averted. — **Seek me,** says Jehovah. What is meant by seeking Jehovah becomes clearer as the prophet proceeds. He is certainly not to be sought *at* Bethel or any of the other shrines to which Israel were devoted (*v.* 5), but *in* righteous conduct, especially toward the lowly and unfortunate (*vv.* 14, 24). — **and live,** escape present danger and enjoy future prosperity.

5. **seek not,** with the hope of saving yourselves by even the most zealous observance of rites and ceremonies.[1] — **Beersheba,** another very ancient sanctuary. It is first mentioned (proleptically) in connection with the expulsion of Hagar (Gen. xxi. 14). It is said to have received its name from the well dug there by Abraham (Gen. xxi. 31; compare xxvi. 33). This patriarch also built there the altar to Jehovah (Gen. xxi. 33), afterward restored by Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 25) and Jacob (Gen. xlvi. 1), to which the place owed its sanctity.

(Isa. x. 32; Jer. xlvi. 24; Isa. xlvii. 1). Sometimes the two occur together (Isa. xxxvii. 22; Jer. xlvi. 11; Jer. xiv. 17). The word *virgin* alone is never used with any other name than *Israel*, and *Israel* is never preceded by *daughter* in this sense, either alone or with *virgin*. Moreover, Jeremiah is the only other sacred author who uses (three times) the expression here employed. On the construction see Ges. 116, 5.

[1] The tone is here deprecatory as indicated by the negative אַל, but in the following two sentences לֹא denotes that it is prohibitory. See Ges. 152, 1.

At the time when Amos prophesied it seems to have had an established worship as corrupt as it was popular. Beersheba was repeopled after the captivity (Neh. xi. 27) and continued into the Middle Ages a place of importance. It lay about thirty miles south-west of Hebron, on the road to Egypt, where its ruins may still be seen near two wells from which the Arabs of the neighborhood water their flocks and herds. See Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, 328 ff. — **Gilgal shall go into galling captivity:** this is not a literal translation, but it is as nearly literal as one can make it, and still retain a hint of the play upon the name Gilgal in which the prophet indulges. The meaning of the statement is obvious, *viz.* that Gilgal, now so dear to Israel, will be stripped of its people and its importance in the general devastation of the country.[1] — **Beth-el,** *i.e. the house of God.* — [**Beth-**] **awen,** *i.e. the house of nothingness.* This new name was, it may be, a prophecy of the destruction of Bethel in more than one sense. There had, at an earlier date, been a Beth-awen in the neighborhood of Bethel (Josh. vii. 2; xviii. 12) which seems to have disappeared before the time of Amos. When, therefore, the prophet called Bethel *Beth-awen,* he may have meant not only that it would be destroyed, but that it would be destroyed like Beth-awen.[2]

[1] The following are specimens of the attempts that have been made to imitate the original: —

Gilgal — giltig entgilt es (Baur);

Gilgal wird Galle weinen (Ewald);

Die Rollstadt (Gilgal) *rollt von dannen* (Orelli).

[2] The word אוֹן means *idolatry* as well as *nothingness.* While, therefore, it is not proper to render it here *idolatry* or, supplying בֵּית, *house of idolatry,* it is probable that this signification of the word was present to the

6. **the house of Joseph:** Joseph as the father of Ephraim and Manasseh, the most powerful tribes of the northern kingdom, stands for Israel in the narrower sense (2 Sam. xix. 21). Compare *Ephraim* in the same sense (Hos. v. 3). — **for Bethel:** the religious center is put for the whole kingdom.[1]

b. The Danger of Resistance, vv. 7–17. — The above exhortation ought to have produced some effect. There was, however, seemingly no sign of repentance. Hence the prophet, with something of his former sternness, proceeds to show what must be the result of a conflict with the Almighty.

7. **Those who:** this abrupt arraignment is as full of impatience and indignation as the *Woe to those who* of *v.* 18 and vi. 1[2] — **turn justice to wormwood,** *i.e.* instead of rendering justice, use the forms of the law in the affliction of their fellows (Lam. iii. 19). See vi. 12. — **cast righteousness to the ground,** substitute for it violence and oppression.[3] Compare *v.* 15. The connection is now broken by the introduction of a description of the power of Jehovah, which Ewald inserts between *vv.* 6 and 7, while Duhm (*TP* 119) and others reject it as an interpolation. This sudden transition, however,

mind of the prophet when he chose it. Perhaps the complete thought might be expressed by saying, Bethel, because it already is Beth-awen in one sense (that of *the house of idolatry*), shall become Beth-awen in the other sense (that of *the house of nothingness*). Hosea, on the other hand, though he borrows the name from Amos, uses it with reference to the idolatry practiced at Bethel. Compare Hoffmann.

[1] A few manuscripts have לבית־ישראל, instead of לבית־אל, and this reading is supported by the Septuagint, but it is probably mistaken.

[2] The article is so strongly demonstrative that it gives to the participle almost the force of a vocative. Ges. 126, 1. *b.*

[3] On the construction of הניחו, see ii. 7.

is so well calculated to bring one back to the point reached at the close of the preceding chapter, and make the sentence to be pronounced impressive that, if the genuineness of the first six verses of this chapter is admitted, that of the three following, and in their present arrangement, can hardly be denied.[1] The connection between *vv.* 7 and 8ff. might be paraphrased as follows: *Ye oppressors, know ye not that Jehovah, whose mercy ye have spurned, is the Maker and Ruler of all things* (*v.* 8), *a mightier than the mightiest* (*v.* 9)*? Therefore ye enemies of righteousness* (*v.* 10) *because ye trample*, etc. Compare Pusey.

8. **the Pleiades and Orion,** two constellations by synecdoche for the hosts of heaven, the most striking manifestation of the creative power of God (Ps. viii. 4), and thus for the visible universe as a whole (compare iv. 13). See Job ix. 9; xxxviii. 31, the only other passages in which these names are mentioned.[2] — **turneth gloom into morning:** out of darkness, not figurative (Keil), but literal (Job iii. 5), bringeth the light of morning, and again, when the day is done, — **darkeneth day into night:** it is the Governor of the world who is here described. The same Power, however, who caused the regular alternation of light and darkness, could also produce such sudden and dreadful phenomena as eclipses. See viii. 9.[3] — **calleth the waters of the sea, and poureth**

[1] Gunning seeks to avoid the difficulties of the passage by rejecting *v.* 7. Compare W. Robertson Smith, *PI* 398 f.

[2] Hoffmann, on the other hand, who renders כימה *Sirius* (compare Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, 70), claims that these stars are mentioned because they were supposed to influence the weather, and Amos wished to assert the supremacy of Jehovah over all such powers. Compare the Septuagint.

[3] For לילה many manuscripts have ללילה, which is probably the correct reading.

them upon the face of the earth: these words have been interpreted as referring to the rains (Orelli), or the streams (Hitzig), by which the earth is watered; but there are peculiarities about them, *e.g.* the expressions *call* and *face of the earth*, which indicate that some extraordinary phenomenon, such as a flood, perhaps the Noachian deluge, is intended. If this view is correct, the three illustrations of the power of Jehovah form a series, and this last suggests the application of the thought that immediately follows; Jehovah, by whom the world was made, of whose will the order and harmony in nature are an expression, and at whose command the forces in nature may become as destructive as they have been beneficent, — Jehovah

9. **causeth violence to burst upon the strong,** as suddenly as the light breaks upon the sight when morning dawns. — **upon the stronghold,** or castle, in which the rich and noble oppressor may have intrenched himself. See iii. 11.[1]

10. **They hate:** the charge contained in *v.* 7 is essentially repeated. This fact in itself is strong proof that *vv.* 8 f. are also *the words of Amos.* — **in the gate,** the place where justice (or injustice) was administered (Ru. iv. 1). — **one who reproveth,** one who is not afraid to rebuke evil-doers. — **one who speaketh uprightly,** renders just decisions.[2]

11. **Therefore:** see iii. 11; iv. 12. — **ye trample upon**

[1] Hoffmann, by slightly changing the text, gets the following curious translation: *who causeth Taurus* (שׁר for שׁד) *to rise after Capella* (עז for עז), *and maketh Taurus set* (יָבֹא for יָבוֹא) *after Vindemiator*, which, however, is entirely arbitrary and indefensible.

[2] The change of תָּמִים to חֲמִים suggested by Hoffmann, would only obscure a now perfectly simple parallelism.

the lowly : the directness of this accusation is its striking feature. Compare ii. 10. What is meant by *trampling upon the lowly* is explained by the next sentence.[1] — **take a present of grain :** the context, especially *vv.* 7 and 12, indicates that it is not cruel creditors, such as are described Neh. v. 9 ff. (Baur), but corrupt judges who are addressed. The peasant had to buy the favor of these, his natural protectors, with a share of the scanty product of his labor.[2] — **houses of hewn stone :** palaces such as those of which Isaiah (ix. 9) represents them as boasting. — **ye shall not dwell in them :** see Deut. xxviii. 30 ; compare Am. ix. 14.

12. **persecutors of the guiltless** is an indignant characterization of the unjust judges of Israel, like *v.* 7. See also ii. 7 ; iii. 10. — **takers of bribes,** lit. *a bribe.* The bribes were given by rich criminals when an attempt was made to bring them to justice for their crimes against the poor.[3] — **yea, the needy,** those who have no means of purchasing their favor. — **they thrust aside,** prevent from obtaining their rights. The third person does not imply contempt (Keil). It simply relaxes the tension of direct invective. See *v.* 7.

[1] The form בושסתם is by Hitzig derived from בוש and rendered *abuse*, but the more reasonable opinion is that it is a derivative of בום. Most authorities explain it as a Pilel Infinitive for בוססכם, the use of which is one of the peculiarities of Amos' language. Compare מעיק for מציק ii. 13; מתאב for מתעב vi. 8; מסרף for משרף vi. 10; and ישחק for יצחק vii. 9, 16. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.), however, corrects the text by dropping ש and thus obtaining a Kal Infinitive with the same meaning.

[2] The Imperfect תקחו describes a practice. Compare Hitzig.

[3] The word כפר is generally rendered *ransom*, and interpreted as the price paid for their lives by rich murderers, and accepted by the judges contrary to Num. xxxv. 31 (Keil), but, since it is also used in the sense of *bribe* (1 Sam. xii. 3), and there has thus far been no mention of the shedding of blood, it seems safer to adopt this latter rendering.

13. **Therefore:** because the wicked, for the time being, are in power. — **he that is prudent,** any one who follows the dictates of good judgment. There is nothing to indicate that a contrast between such a one and the prophet (Hitzig) is intended. — **will keep silence,** hold himself as much as possible aloof from affairs and let things take their course, lest he also come into conflict with the powerful and unprincipled of his people. — **at such a time,** lit. *at that time*, a time not future (Gunning), but present, *such a time* as that just described. — **an evil time,** not merely a time when corruption prevails (Keil), but a time when one may well be anxious for his personal safety.[1] After this reflection the prophet, remembering what must be the consequences of such a state of things, renews his exhortation.

14. **Seek good** explains what was meant by seeking Jehovah *v.* 4, which is still more closely defined in *v.* 15. See Mic. vi. 8. — **not evil:** compare *v.* 15. — **the God of hosts,** in his saving might. — **as ye say:** here is a distinct statement of what was easily inferred from iv. 4 f., *viz.* that, far as Israel had gone in actual apostasy from Jehovah, they still rendered him a kind of homage and supposed that they enjoyed his favor. The idea reappears, *v.* 18 and ix. 7. They were doubtless deceived by the prosperity to which the vigorous policy of Jeroboam had assisted them. Amos insists that they are mistaken; that those only can claim the favor of Jehovah whose lives reflect the righteousness of their God. See *v.* 24; Ps. l. 23.

[1] Gunning connects בעת ההיא as an object with המשכיל (Dan. ix. 13), and renders the whole verse: *Therefore shall he who understands this time keep silence, for it shall be an evil time.*

15. **Hate evil,** instead of uprightness (*v.* 10). — **love good,** instead of mere ceremonial (iv. 5). — **establish justice,** instead of violating it (*v.* 7). — **perchance:** grievously as Israel have sinned there is yet hope for those who repent (Joel ii. 14).[1] — **a remnant:** a repentant and purified few from the sinful mass of the house of Joseph. This is the remnant whose preservation Amos himself finally prophesies (ix. 8 f.) and whose future the later prophets, especially Isaiah, delight in describing (Mic. iv. 7; Isa. xi. 11).[2]

16. **Therefore:** the prophet, without waiting for a reply to his exhortation, because he knows that it will have no effect, proceeds to describe the result of neglecting it. Compare Justi. — **the Lord:** this arrangement of the divine names is unique. Compare iii. 13. — **In all squares,** the open spaces, especially near the gates (Neh. viii. 1), not only in Samaria (Hitzig), but in all the cities and villages of the land. — **lamentation,** for the dead. — **Woe! woe!** compare Jer. xxii. 18; Eze. xxx. 2. The Orientals are very demonstrative on such occasions (Matt. ix. 23). See Thomson, *LB*, I. 245 f. — **they shall summon:** the subject, like that of the preceding verb, is indefinite.[3] — **the husbandman,** who is at work in his field. The wail from his city or village will reach him,

[1] On יחנן see Ges. 67, R 10.

[2] The translation *the remnant* (Hitzig) implies that Israel had already been brought to the verge of annihilation, which is not the fact. Compare Wellhausen, *SV*, V. The nation had never before seemed so prosperous and powerful (2 Kings xiv. 25). Hence Oort (*TT*, 1880, 122), who also inserts *vv.* 13 f. after *v.* 20, is obliged to reject this verse as a gloss added after the fall of Samaria. On the construction see Deut. xxii. 19; 1 Sam. iv. 12; Ges.[25] 127, R 3.

[3] Ewald makes אכר the subject of קראו. So also Gunning, who insists that the effect of the wrath of Jehovah upon the country is here described.

and he will join in the general lamentation. — **require lamentation :** the verb has to be supplied from the preceding. — **those skilled in wailing,** professional mourners whose business it was to attend funerals. They were usually women (Jer. ix. 16), but men also were sometimes employed for the purpose.[1] See Van Lennep, *BL* 586; Thomson, *LB*, III. 401 ff.[2]

17. **the vineyards,** where, if anywhere, there would naturally be mirth (Jud. ix. 27). The songs of the vintagers will suddenly be changed to — **lamentation** (Isa. xvi. 10), and the land will become a land of mourners (viii. 8). — **I will pass through thy midst,** as a destroyer. The reference to the plague by which the first-born of the Egyptians were destroyed (Ex. xii. 12) is unmistakable, but it need not, therefore, be supposed that Amos here predicts just such a visitation. He evidently expected Israel to be desolated by war. See *v.* 27; vi. 14.

c. Some Perilous Delusions, vv. 18–27. — The rest of this chapter deals with delusions like that to which *v.* 14 refers, delusions in consequence of which Israel were able to persuade themselves that the visitation predicted would be unjust if it were possible. The prophet first warns them of their mistake with reference to

THE DAY OF JEHOVAH, *vv.* 18–20. — 18. **Woe,** more forcible than a mere denial. — **to those who wish for,** represent as something earnestly desired and expected

[1] The word here translated *skilled* is masculine, as is the word for *mourners* (Eccl. xii. 5).

[2] The change in the construction after קראו is confusing. One would have expected in the second clause ואל־מספד יודעי נחי, and this is the reading that would correspond to the Vulgate and the Peshita, but the Septuagint confirms the correctness of the Masoretic text. Compare Hoffmann.

(Isa. v. 19). — **the day of Jehovah:** this is a formula for approaching judgment frequent in the books of the prophets. It is a favorite with Joel, who uses it four times (i. 15; ii. 1; iii. 4; iv. 14) and describes it in such terms as, on the supposition that he preceded Amos, would explain the error that the latter combats; for according to Joel iv. 11 ff. the day of Jehovah is a day of destruction only for the heathen. — **It is darkness:** the most prominent feature of the day of Jehovah, as Joel describes it, is darkness. It is *a day of darkness and gloom, a day of cloud and shadow* (ii. 2), when *the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood* (iii. 4), and *the stars shall withdraw their brightness* (iv. 15). Amos recalls this gloomy picture and asserts that the day of Jehovah will be a day of darkness, *i.e.* disaster, for Israel as well as their neighbors. Moreover, it is inevitable, as the prophet teaches by a characteristic (see iii. 12) comparison in the following verse. Compare Isa. xxiv. 18.

19. **a lion:** see iii. 4. — **a bear:** bears were once quite common in all parts of Palestine (1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Kings ii. 24), but they are now found only about Mount Hermon, where they often do much damage to orchards and sometimes attack the flocks or even human beings. See Van Lennep, *BL* 259 ff.; Thomson, *LB*, II. 520. — **and, when,** having escaped this second, but not necessarily greater danger (compare Pusey). — **he came home,** took refuge in his house. — **rested his hand against the wall,** as one would naturally do when terrified and nearly exhausted. — **a serpent should bite him:** there are many varieties of snakes known in Palestine, some of which (5) are poisonous. (Tristram, *Natural*

History of the Bible, 269 ff.). The prophet probably had in mind the adder or the viper (Job xx. 16), which hides in the cracks and crevices of old walls, whence it attacks any one who disturbs it. See Van Lennep, *BL* 307 ff.; Thomson, *LB*, II. 591. Such a reptile, though not more dangerous than a lion or a bear, might succeed in that which both of these beasts failed to accomplish. The point of the illustration, therefore, is that Israel have nothing but disasters to expect until they are destroyed. See ix. 1 ff.

20. This verse is an emphatic repetition of the statement of *v.* 18, which the comparison was intended to illustrate, — **gloomy without any brightness,** absolutely hopeless.

RITES AND CEREMONIES, *vv.* 21–27. — Amos now proceeds to demolish the foundation upon which Israel based their faith in the favor of Jehovah, their zeal in the externals of religion. It was clear enough from iv. 4 f. that this was worse than useless, but the passage which now follows is a more distinct and unmistakable declaration that Jehovah desires obedience and not sacrifice (see Isa. i. 10 ff.).

21. **I hate,** not because they are essentially hateful, but because they are used to cloak the sins of the worshiper. — **your feasts,** such as that of tabernacles, which, in the northern kingdom, was celebrated on the fifteenth of the eighth month (1 Kings xii. 32). — **I take no delight in,** lit. *I do*, or *will, not smell* (Gen. viii. 21; Ex. xxix. 41). — **your festivals,** strictly the offerings presented on such occasions (Isa. i. 13),[1] which are mentioned in the following verse.

[1] The word עצרה, or עצרת, the plural of which is found only in this

22. **burnt-offerings,** beasts or birds that were entirely consumed on the altar (Lev. i. 3 ff.), especially on the occasion of feasts. — **vegetable offerings,** offerings of flour, raw or cooked, made alone or in connection with other offerings, that were usually wholly, or in part, consumed on the altar (Lev. ii. 1 ff.; Num. xv. 1 ff.). — **peace-offering :** beasts, parts of which, after they had been devoted to Jehovah, were burned on the altar, while the rest was divided between the priests and the worshiper (Lev. iii. 1 ff.). See Isa. i. 11. It was the fat that was burned to Jehovah, hence the fitness of the addition of[1] — **of your fatlings,** *i.e.* consisting of fatlings.

23. **Away from me,** cease! — **noise :** the best of music becomes mere noise when, for any reason, it ceases to appeal to him who hears it (vi. 5). Compare Isa. i. 12. — **songs :** the connection requires one to suppose that psalms are intended. — **psalteries :** instruments, probably resembling the harp, which sometimes had as many as ten strings (Ps. xxxiii. 2), and were used to accompany sacred (Ps. lxxi. 22) as well as secular songs (Isa. v. 12). See Smith, *BD*, art. *Psaltery;* Riehm, *HBA*, art. *Musik.*

24. The prophet here interrupts himself to state once more, but this time only parenthetically, the terms on which Jehovah's favor is really to be secured. — **justice,** not divine retribution (Keil), but judicial fairness between man and man. — **roll,** prevail, being cultivated

passage, is oftenest used of the last day of the feast of the passover (Deut. xvi. 8) or tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 36), not, however, as is generally supposed, in the sense of *solemn assembly* (Keil), but in that of *holiday*. In this case it is clearly a synonym of חג. See also 2 Kings x. 20; Isa. i. 13; Joel i. 14.

[1] The singular שלם is not found elsewhere.

with as much zeal as is now shown for mere ritual. — **as water,** promoting social development, as vegetable life is furthered by abundant water. Compare *v.* 7. The beneficial effects of justice are suggested by the term — **righteousness,** which sometimes, in the Old Testament, is almost the equivalent of *beneficence* (Isa. xlv. 8). — **a living stream,** perennial as well as copious. In a country where most of the streams became dry in summer no more effective figure could have been employed.

25. This verse also belongs to the parenthesis, being an illustration of the doctrine taught in the preceding. The passage is precisely analogous to that in which Paul proves circumcision unnecessary (Rom. iv. 10 f.). The prophet, therefore, says, in effect: Put not your trust in ritual. It, without righteousness, is vain. Have ye not heard how it was neglected while our fathers wandered in the desert? — **Did ye bring** implies a negative answer. See Wellhausen, *SV*, V. It has been objected that this interpretation contradicts the Pentateuch. In reply to this objection it is only necessary to recall the fact that, in the book of Joshua (v. 5), it is distinctly stated that, during the period preceding the occupation of Canaan, circumcision had been neglected, a fact which, since only those who were circumcised could eat the passover (Ex. xii. 48), implies that this feast was observed for the first time in many years at Gilgal (Josh. v. 10). If, now, the passover was neglected, is it probable that the less important but more burdensome requirements of the ritual that Moses may have ordained were observed?[1] — **me:** not emphatic

[1] Most scholars agree in rendering the ה before זבחים as an interrogative, but some treat it as an article and thus obtain a statement that sacri-

(Keil), as if the neglect of Jehovah's worship were contrasted with the practice of idolatry. — **sacrifices:** not free-will offerings, as contrasted with those which were required (Lightfoot), but sacrifices in general, as the mention of the — **vegetable offering** clearly indicates. Under these two heads are included offerings of all sorts. It is probable, however, that Amos intends to say, not that offerings were entirely unknown in the wilderness, but that they were generally (and necessarily) discontinued. See Jer. vii. 22. — **in the desert forty years,** *i.e.* during those forty years that ye spent in the desert. That the practice of making offerings to Jehovah existed before the Exodus and was resumed after the conquest of Canaan seems clearly to be implied.

26. This verse is related to *vv.* 23 f. just as *v.* 15 is to *vv.* 12 and 14. Verse 24, like *v.* 14, is, as has already been explained, an exhortation interjected into a denunciation, a last offer of mercy, which, however, Amos does not expect to see accepted. He, therefore, just as he did in *v.* 15, without waiting for Israel to put their rejection of this overture into words, proceeds to declare the penalty of their obstinacy. In order, then, to get the force of this verse, one must, for the time being, ignore *vv.* 24 f. and read it as a sort of apodosis to *vv.* 21–23, thus: I hate your feasts with all their ceremonies; therefore take the idols in whose service ye have learned your notions of religion and go into captivity.[1]

fices of some sort were actually offered in the desert (Dahl). The same result is reached by those who, though they regard הֲ as an interrogative, insist that an affirmative answer is expected (Vaihinger). In both cases *v.* 25 must be too closely connected with *v.* 26.

[1] The ו prefixed to ונשאתם is ambiguous, since the accent, without its influence, must fall on the last syllable. This fact has made it possible to

— **Sakkuth** is another name for the Assyrian god Adar, *i.e.* the planet Saturn (Schrader, *KAT* 442 f.; Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Paradies*, 215),[1] who, in 2 Kings xvii. 31, is called *Adrammelek*, *i.e. Adar is prince* or *king*. This latter name explains the descriptive title — **your king** (Schrader, *KAT* 284). — **Kewan** is also a name of the planet Saturn (Ass. *Kaiwanu*), and therefore identified with Sakkuth (Schrader, *KAT* 442).[2] — **your star-god**, lit. *the star of your god*, defines Kewan.[3] — **your images**

mistake the connection and render the verb as a Perfect, describing a practice of the Hebrews in the desert (Keil), or until the time of Amos (Baudissin), or as a Present, accusing the contemporaries of the prophet of the same practice (Hoffmann). The analogy of *v.* 15 requires that ו be regarded as a ו consecutive introducing a conclusion and נשאתם, by virtue of its connection with הסר rendered as an Imperative. See Ges. 116, 6, *c.* Compare Peters, *Hebraica*, April, 1885.

[1] In the Masoretic text the word is improperly pointed. It has also been rendered as an appellative; most frequently by *tent* or *booth* as if it were סֻכַּת (Keil), but also by *stake* (Ewald), *block* (Hitzig), and *statue* (Rosenmüller). But it seems plain from the connection that a deity is meant. Compare Hoffmann.

[2] The word כיון has been less frequently misunderstood than סכות. Thus the Septuagint, in which the latter is rendered by *σκηνή*, has a mistaken or corrupted transcription of the former, *viz.* Ῥαιφάν (Ῥεφάν) which, in Acts vii. 43, has become Ῥομφάν (Ῥομφά). Some modern commentators have been similarly inconsistent in their treatment of these words, and therefore, to preserve the parallelism, have been obliged to imitate the Septuagint by mistranslating מלככם *your Molech* (Baur), others, following Jerome, interpret כיון also as an appellative; *frame* (Ewald), *column* (Hitzig), or *statue* (Gesenius).

[3] In the Masoretic text this appellative is separated from כיון by צלמיכם, but there is little doubt that the original arrangement, if the text is otherwise correct, was either the one here adopted or the inverted one favored by the Septuagint, *viz.* כוכב אלהיכם כיון צלמיכם, for it is only by such a change in the arrangement that the sentence can be made intelligible. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) simplifies the text by dropping כוכב and צלמיכם as glosses to כיון and אלהיכם respectively, and then destroys the connection between *vv.* 25 and 27 by dropping *v.* 26 entire.

which ye have made for yourselves: whatever may be the exact meaning of the rest of the verse, it is perfectly plain that in these words Amos accuses Israel of idolatry in addition to their other sins, and that in the following verse he orders them into captivity with the idols to which they are devoted (Hos. iv. 17).

27. **beyond Damascus,** to Assyria, whence their idols had been imported. In Acts vii. 43, Stephen, who evidently intended to follow the Septuagint, substitutes Babylon for Damascus.

d. The Humiliation of Israel, vi. — The only hope of Israel was a false hope. Its worthlessness has been exposed. There is therefore now nothing for them to expect but destruction. In the following chapter the fate to which they are doomed is contrasted with their present seemingly fortunate circumstances. It is —

THE HEIGHT OF LUXURY, *vv.* 1–7, from which they are to fall.

1. **the careless,** those whose prosperity has made them insensible to danger (Isa. xxxii. 9, 11). — **in Zion,** the citadel of Jerusalem for Jerusalem itself.[1] — **in the mountain of Samaria,** Samaria on its mountain. See iii. 9. — **the noted,** lit. *the marked, i.e.* those distinguished by their rank or wealth from their fellows; the first in the nation. But this nation, the Hebrew people, was — **the first of the nations** (iii. 2). What an honor, then, to be reckoned among its nobility! — **the house of Israel,** of both kingdoms. — **come,** not as teachers of foreign

[1] Cornill (*Einleitung*) suspects the genuineness of בציון, unjustly, for its retention in the text is required by the phrase *these kingdoms* in the next verse; but any reference to Judah may have been omitted from the prophecy as originally *delivered.*

customs (Hoffmann), but as their judges and rulers. The phrase *the first of the nations* suggests, not a warning (Baur), but a flattering comparison between the Hebrews and their neighbors. Are ye not, says Amos, first among the nations?

2. **Go over,** the Euphrates. — **Kalneh,** probably the Kalno of Isa. x. 9 and the Kanneh of Eze. xxvii. 23, was one of the four cities which at first constituted the kingdom of Nimrod (Gen. x. 10). It has been (wrongly) identified with Ctesiphon on the Tigris (Orelli), and with Niffer in Mesopotamia (Rawlinson, in Smith, *BD*). The most attractive view is that it is the Kulunu mentioned by Sargon among his conquests in Babylonia. See Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Paradies*, 225. Wherever it was, when Amos wrote, it was, or formed a part of, a considerable power. — **Hamath the great,** originally a Canaanite settlement (Gen. x. 18), was situated on the Orontes, at the northern extremity of the territory assigned to the chosen people (Num. xxxiv. 8). In fact, it was, for a time, under David and Solomon, a part of the Hebrew kingdom (2 Sam. viii. 9; 2 Chron. viii. 4). Later it became tributary to Assyria, having probably been subdued by Assur-nasir-pal in 876 B.C. In 854 B.C. its king, Irhulina, joined the great coalition against Assyria, in which Benhadad of Syria and Ahab of Israel also figured, and was defeated with the rest by Shalmaneser II. (Schrader, *KAT* 193 ff.). Hamath afterwards fell away from Assyria, but whether Jeroboam II. really conquered it or only extended his kingdom to its borders is not clear. Compare 2 Kings xiv. 28 with Am. vi. 14; 2 Kings xiv. 25. If he conquered it, it did not suffer much at his hands or remain long in subjection, for about 741

B.C. it joined a league, to which Judah also seems to have belonged, to oppose Tiglath-pileser III. in his advance toward the Mediterranean (Schrader, *KAT* 217 ff.). The forces of the league were overthrown by the Assyrian king, and Hamath was deprived of a part of its territory (nineteen districts), but even then it was not subdued. It remained for Sargon in 720 to complete its subjection (Schrader, *KAT* 323 f.). When, therefore, Sennacherib attempted to frighten Hezekiah into submission (2 Kings xix. 13), it had been overthrown, but not when Amos lived and prophesied. Even then the city did not cease to exist. Indeed, though it has suffered various vicissitudes, it is still, under the name Hama, a place of thirty thousand inhabitants (Smith, *BD*).[1] **Gath of the Philistines:** Gath was one of the five principal cities of Philistia. Its site is disputed, but whether it is to be identified with Tell es-Safieh (Porter in Smith, *BD*) or Dikrin (Guerin, *Judèe*, II. 108 f.), it was nearer to the border of Judah than either of the other cities (1 Sam. xvii. 52), and therefore the one that would naturally represent Philistia to one *going down* into that country. Of its existence when Amos wrote, the mention of it in connection with Kalneh and Hamath for the purpose that Amos clearly had in mind is sufficient evidence. See i. 8. Its capture and destruction by Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 6) took place at a later date. — **Are they,** Kalneh, Hamath, and Gath. — **these kingdoms,** the kingdoms of Judah and Israel. A negative answer is of course expected.[2] — **your border:** the use

[1] On the punctuation of חמת, see Ges.[25] 125, 2, R 2.

[2] To supply an affirmative answer (Knobel) is to force upon the sentence an interpretation that does not fit the context. On the other hand, to follow the ancient versions and some manuscripts, and render the ה pre-

of the pronoun *your* forbids the supposition that it is the nobles of Israel by whom these words are spoken (Gunning). They would have said *our border*. The words are the words of the prophet, who thereby reminds Israel that Jehovah has given his people a fairer country, with wider borders, than either of the neighboring nations could boast. Compare Henderson.[1] Having thus shown how Jehovah had favored the Hebrews as a people, Amos now describes how Israel in particular has requited his goodness.

3. **postpone,** not actually delay it, but refuse to believe that it is imminent (ix. 10). — **the evil day,** the day of Jehovah, as the prophet described it v. 18 ff. Meanwhile they blindly — **bring near,** *i.e.* set up in their very midst[2] — **the seat of violence,** a seat for such as practice violence, *e.g.* unjust judges. Thus, while scorning the prophet's warning, they so conduct themselves as to hasten their own destruction.[3]

fixed to טובים as an article (Credner), is to rob the entire verse of any meaning whatever. The only other translation that would accord with the context is: *Are there fairer kingdoms than these?* in which *these* would refer to Kalneh, etc. The rest of the verse would then mean that fair as these were, they were not so large as the heritage of the Hebrews. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) misinterprets the intention of the prophet (or rather the interpolator) and corrects the text, inserting אתם after הטובים and changing גבולם מגבולם to גבולכם מגבולם to suit his interpretation.

[1] Bickell (Schrader, *KAT* 445) gives four reasons for regarding this verse as an interpolation. Three of them have already been answered. The first, and with him perhaps the weightiest, that the metre of the verse is different from that of the context, is based on a theory of Hebrew poetry that still needs confirmation. See also Wellhausen, *SV*, V.

[2] On ותגשון see Ges. p. 126, n. 2.

[3] The changes in the text suggested by Hoffmann, המנדרים for המנדים and לְשַׁבָּת = שַׁבָּת for לְשָׁבֶת, by means of which he gets: *Ye who daily demand unjust* [*tribute*] *and every Sabbath require unrighteous* [*gain*],

4. **ivory couches,** couches whose frames were inlaid with ivory. Such couches were among the articles that Sennacherib boasts of having received of Hezekiah (Schrader, *KAT* 288 ff.). The same style of furniture is still highly prized in the East. — **stretched,** like foreign voluptuaries. It was the earlier custom to sit at table (1 Sam. xx. 24). — **lambs from the flock,** the daintiest of viands (2 Kings iii. 4). — **calves from the midst of the stall,** like the prodigal son (Lu. xv. 23).

5. **twitter,** or *prattle,* indicates the contempt that Amos felt for the perhaps really not unmusical songs with which feasts were enlivened (v. 23). — **to the note of the psaltery,** with which they accompany themselves. — **think,** fondly, but falsely, imagine.[1] — **for them,** to handle as artists. — **as for David:** this comparison implies that David enjoyed a great reputation as a musician among the Hebrews, and this implication is confirmed by various references to his skill in other books (1 Sam. xvi. 18), but it does not imply that he was chiefly famous as a composer and performer of secular music (Driver, *Introduction,* 356; Wellhausen, *SV,* V.).

6. **from basins,** such as were employed for sacrificial purposes (Zech. xiv. 20), because they were larger (and finer) than the vessels ordinarily used in drinking (Isa. v. 11, 22). — **the first of oils,** the finest procurable. — **affliction of Joseph,** the affliction in store for their people (*v.* 3; Is. v. 12).[2]

only make a tolerably intelligible passage more difficult. Compare Wellhausen, *SV,* V.

[1] The rendering *invent,* preferred by many (Keil), besides being grammatically objectionable (Baur), fails to preserve the ironical tone of the preceding statement.

[2] On the punctuation of שִׁבְרִ, see Ges.[25] 93, R 1, D.

7. **at the head of the captives:** being the first of the nations, and having always treated themselves to the first of the delights of life, it is but fitting that they should head the procession going into captivity. — **the shout of banqueters,** the repulsive mirth of *outstretched* feasters. — **shall cease,** and lamentation take its place.[1]

THE DEPTH OF MISERY, *vv.* 8–14, threatened Israel is finally described with painful vividness.

8. **by himself:** compare iv. 2. — **I abhor,**[2] what seems to them most precious, — **the glory of Jacob,** not the true glory of Jacob (viii. 7), but their boasted wealth and power as appears from the mention in the next clause of — **his palaces:** the reason why their palaces are hateful to Jehovah is that they are storehouses for the spoils of oppression (iii. 10). — **give over,** to its enemies and besiegers. — **the city,** Samaria, the center of corruption. — **all that is in it,** its people and its treasures.[3]

9. **if there be left,** untouched by the sword. — **ten men,** who, because they have escaped death in one form, expect to be preserved. — **in one house,** perhaps an as yet unbroken family. — **they shall die,** shall finally perish.

10. **And when,** after nine of the ten have died. — **one's relative and burier,** lit. *burner, i.e.* the relative whose duty it is to burn, not the body of his kinsman, either within (Hitzig) or without the house (Keil), but

[1] The verb סר was probably chosen for the sake of the alliteration that it produces with מרזח סרוחים.

[2] מתאב, an error for מתעב; see v. 11.

[3] Hoffmann reads ומִלוֹאה *and her citadel,* thus disturbing the connection with the following verse.

something, either spices, as the English version of Jer. xxxiv. 5 suggests, or, as is still the custom at the tombs of saints, costly stuffs (Thomson, *LB*, II. 578) in his honor (2 Chron. xvi. 14; xxi. 19). The opposite view is forbidden not only by the fact that the Hebrews, except in the case of Saul (1 Sam. xxxi. 12), are not known to have burned the bodies of any but criminals (Josh. vii. 25), and the further fact, which seems to have been generally overlooked, that, in a country so barren of timber as Palestine, the cremation of any number of bodies, especially under such circumstances as Amos has in mind, would not only be difficult, but impossible (2 Kings vi. 1 ff.).[1] — **take one,** any one of the nine dead. — **the bones,** *i.e.* the corpse (Ex. xiii. 19). — **from the house,** for burial. — **shall say:** the subject is still the relative. — **to one,** the last of the ten, who has dragged himself into — **the inmost of the house,** the part usually assigned to the women (Ps. cxxviii. 3), to die. — **Is there yet any,** who is alive. — **with thee,** besides thee. — **he shall say,** *viz.* the sole survivor. — **none:** there is more in this word than the information desired by the questioner. It is a cry, the last broken, heartrending utterance of a deserted soul. It is this cry in reply to which the relative says: — **Hush,** forbidding any appeal for help or sympathy. — **one may not make mention of the name of Jehovah,** claim him as one's defender and deliverer (Ps. xx. 8). He has ceased

[1] Since there can be no reference to cremation, Hoffmann's suggestion that the original text read ונשאו דורו משרפו, *and his burners shall rear his funeral pyre,* is entirely gratuitous. The only correction in the text for which there is authority is the change of מסרפו to משרפו, which has the support of many manuscripts. See v. 11.

to be our God, and become our destroyer. Compare Hitzig.[1]

11. **will command,** his instruments, the enemies of Israel. See *v.* 14. — **the great house:** not the kingdom of Israel (Orelli), but the palace of the noble (iii. 15). — **the small house:** the modest dwelling of the poor man; for though it is the nobles who have chiefly offended Jehovah, the other classes will necessarily suffer with them when the kingdom is overthrown. Perhaps, however, the prophet intends to indicate that the poor will suffer less than the rich, for he says that the houses of the former will be rent with — **breaches,** while those of the latter are beaten to **atoms.** This description of the devastating effects of Jehovah's anger suggests the madness of neglecting or resisting his will, which is the subject of the next two verses.

12. **on the rock,** or cliff, where the wild goats can hardly find a footing (Job xxxix. 1). — **the sea with oxen,** as one would plow a field.[2] Only a lunatic would imagine either possible. — **But ye** have attempted something equally mad in that[3] — **ye have turned justice to gall,** in defiance of Jehovah, who is pledged to make sin the ruin of the sinner. Who can contend with the Almighty? As well try to make a horse gallop over the treacherous surface of the rocks, or to plow the bottomless sea with

[1] The emendation suggested by Oort (*TT*, 1880, 138) would totally destroy the beauty of this touching passage.

[2] The rendering given assumes that the Hebrew text is corrupt, and that the correct reading is that suggested by J. D. Michaelis, בבקר ים for בבקרים. In favor of this emendation is that thus the second is made a distinct illustration, and the use of a very rare (Neh. x. 37; 2 Chron. iv. 3) plural is avoided. See Ges.[25] p. 382, n.; also Wellhausen, *SV*, V.

[3] On *but* for כי see iii. 7.

oxen (iv. 12 f.). — **the fruits of righteousness,** the benefits of a faithful administration of justice. — **to wormwood:** see v. 7.

13. **that which is not,** lit. *a not thing*, a thing that has no existence (Deut. xxxii. 21), their boasted strength. — **taken to ourselves horns,** acquired power (Jer. xlviii. 25). The same figure is used of Joseph in the blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 17).[1]

14. **For,** as a means of destroying you (*v.* 11) in spite of your imagined strength (*v.* 13). — **I will raise up,** endow and commission. — **a nation,** Assyria, though in this passage there is nothing to indicate whence the invader is to come. See v. 27. — **the entrance to Hamath,** the northern boundary of the Promised Land and the kingdom of Israel (Num. xxxiv. 8; 2 Kings xiv. 25). — **the stream of the Arabah:** the supposition that, in *v.* 11 as well as *v.* 1, there is reference to both of the Hebrew kingdoms has led to the identification of this stream with Wady el-Arish, called, Num. xxxiv. 5, *the stream of Egypt* (Wellhausen), or even with the Nile (Henry). Others have identified it with the Dead Sea (Dahl), the Kedron (Rosenmüller), or one of the streams flowing into it from the east. The fact that in 2 Kings xiv. 25 the *sea of the Arabah* is given as the southern boundary of the kingdom of Israel favors some such view, and since it is hardly probable that the Dead Sea would be called a *wady*, one seems forced to look for *the*

[1] A suggestion of Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) deserves mention. He proposes to read both לא דבר and קרנים as proper names, the names of two cities east of the Jordan, the Lo-debar of 2 Sam. ix. 4 f.; xvii. 27, and the Karnayim of 1 Macc. v. 26, and Gen. xiv. 5, which he supposes Israel to have taken, though his interpretation of v. 15 would hardly lead one to regard them as capable of such an exploit.

stream of the Arabah among its feeders. A favorite opinion is that it is the so-called *brook of the willows* of Isa. xv. 7, and that both are identical with Wady el-Ahsi, the ancient boundary between Moab and Edom, which flows into the southern end of the Dead Sea (Gunning).[1] This opinion, however, is based upon the assumption that Moab had been reduced to subjection by Jeroboam II., an assumption that remains to be proved. See ii. 1. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as satisfactory. It is safer, for the present, interpreting 2 Kings xiv. 25, as one naturally would, to mean that Jeroboam II. extended his kingdom *as far as* the Dead Sea, or, at the farthest, no farther than Deut. iii. 16 f. would permit one to assert, to adopt the view that the *stream of the Arabah* was one of the streams flowing into the northern end of the Dead Sea, which was at that time the boundary between Israel and Moab. See Hoffmann.

III.

ISRAEL'S FATE ILLUSTRATED (vii.–ix.).

It would seem almost impossible to bring before the mind more vividly than has been done in the preceding chapters the disastrous consequences to Israel of their desertion from Jehovah. Yet that is precisely what Amos attempted in this last part of his book. The means which he adopted was well adapted to his purpose, for his visions are nothing more nor less than pictures, quite as real to an oriental as if they appealed to his sight instead of his imagination; and pictures will interest when the truths that they teach, if other-

[1] The הערבים of Isa. xv. 7 is supposed to be a mistake for הערבה.

wise presented, would get no attention. The success of the method in this case appears from the fact that, while Amos seems to have been undisturbed in his previous utterances, the priest Amasiah became alarmed and undertook to silence him as soon as he began his illustrated sermons. The first three visions form a series illustrating

1. Justice the Avenger of Mercy (vii.),

of which the historical incident introducing Amasiah gives an opportunity for a personal application.

a. The Visions and their Interpretations, vv. 1–9.

The locusts, *vv.* 1–3. They are made, but mercifully destroyed. — 1. **the Lord Jehovah showed me:** the prophet uses terms that might be interpreted literally to mean that there had been revealed to his external eye such a sight as he describes, yet no one would think of supposing that such had been the case. It is not even necessary to maintain that the picture that he saw with his *inner* eye was anything more than the effect upon his imagination of a truth to which he had attained by the aid of the divine Spirit. The human side of these visions is most apparent in the fourth, the paronomasia in which is hardly worthy of a strictly divine origin. — **he formed:** the subject is Jehovah; the verb is chosen for its picturesqueness. See Gen. ii. 7.[1] — **locusts,** not figurative (Henderson), but literal locusts. In iv. 9 Amos represents these insects as mercifully sent by Jehovah to be the means of bringing Israel back

[1] The ancient versions, excepting the Vulgate, agree in rendering this passage as if the text had יֹצֵר instead of וַיֹּצֶר, and some commentators (Baur), feeling the want of a subject after הִנֵּה, prefer this reading.

to him. In the present passage the mercy of Jehovah appears, not in sending the locusts, but in withdrawing them before they had utterly destroyed the vegetation of the country. It is the same plague viewed from two slightly different standpoints, from the first of which appears the active, from the second the passive side of the divine mercy. — **the aftergrowth,** the last fresh grass that started in the spring under the influence of the so-called latter rains. The date is more exactly given in the words following. — **it was the aftergrowth**[1] **after the king's shearing:** whether the king's sheep were sheared before, after, or at the same time with those of his subjects is not known. It is probable that others waited for the royal shepherds to decide when sheep should be shorn, and that therefore *the king's shearing* was practically the shearing season. In any case it was late in the spring, when rain had nearly ceased to fall, and when the ravages of the locusts would be most disastrous, since, if the crops were then injured, they could not recover.[2]

2. **when they would have wholly devoured,** when they had already begun their ravages and it seemed as if

[1] Hoffmann, on the authority of the Septuagint, changes this second לקש to ילק, another name for the harvest, but the Septuagint has so many evident errors in this passage that it cannot safely be trusted with reference to any part of it. See Wellhausen, *SV*, V.

[2] The word גזי is more commonly rendered *mowings*, but there are good reasons for rejecting this translation as mistaken. In the first place, there is no doubt that in two cases (Deut. xviii. 4; Job xxxi. 20), the singular means *fleece*, *wool*, and, in the only other case in which it occurs (Ps. lxxii. 6), the same rendering would be an improvement upon *hay* or *meadow;* for, in the second place, hay, as such, is, and probably always has been, a thing unknown in Palestine. See Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, 246. Compare Wellhausen, *SV*, V.

they were going to make complete havoc of[1] — **the herbage of the land,** including the springing grass (Ex. x. 12, 15); compare Keil. — **forgive,** the sins to punish which the locusts were sent. — **How shall Jacob stand?** *who is Jacob that he should stand,* or survive so severe punishment.[2] — **he is so small,** and weak, in spite of his boasted strength (vi. 13), in comparison with the destructive agencies that his God can bring against him.

3. The intercession of the prophet was successful. Mercy for the time triumphed over justice. — **Jehovah repented him.** This anthropopathism is natural and

[1] The usual rendering is, *when they had finished devouring,* and the usual method of answering the question which at once arises, *viz.* Of what use was the intercession of the prophet after they had finished their ravages? is to insist upon a distinction between עשב and לקש, and explain that, though the locusts had eaten the *herbs* of the land, the *aftergrowth* had not been touched, so that this could be saved (Keil). This explanation is so unnatural as at once to excite suspicion. On closer examination it is found entirely unsatisfactory. It assumes a distinction between עשב and לקש that was not intended. The aftergrowth is mentioned merely to indicate that the locusts appeared at a time when they would most seriously damage *all* vegetation. This explanation, moreover, ignores the nature and habits of locusts. When they invade a country they devour everything as they advance (Joel ii. 31). It is therefore ridiculous to represent them in this case as sparing the springing grass while they devoured all other herbage. Finally, the interpretation in question overlooks the peculiar construction והיה with which the verse begins. This is not a mistake for ויהי (Ges.[25] 112, 6, *b*, γ; Wellhausen, *SV,* V.), as is apparent from the fact that the same construction occurs in *v.* 4, but a form deliberately chosen for the sake of its peculiar signification. It gives to the whole construction an inchoative character, that would be more exactly expressed by some such rendering as *now it was coming to a pass when they would have wholly devoured,* or, more briefly, *now when they were on the point of devouring,* but which is sufficiently indicated in the translation above given.

[2] For a similar use of מי see Isa. li. 19. The early translators seem to have mistaken יקום for יקים, which last is actually found in a few codices.

allowable in the connection. See Gen. vi. 6. — **of this,** his evident purpose to destroy Israel. — **It shall not be,** *viz.* the result contemplated. It is not so stated, but of course it is implied, that Israel was spared with the hope that after having suffered thus for their sins, they would return to Jehovah. They did not return to him, therefore he sent a second agent to destroy them.

THE FIRE, *vv.* 4–6. — It is kindled but mercifully quenched. 4. **called,** gave command, not to his angels (Mercier), but to the fire itself as his agent. — **to punish by fire,** *i.e.* that punishment be inflicted by fire (Isa. iii. 13). In the first two chapters fire was a symbol for war. It has therefore been supposed that here also Amos has reference to a hostile invasion, *e.g.* that of Tiglath-pileser III. (Henderson). There is, however, nothing in the context to indicate that the word is to be taken figuratively, and, if it were, it could not refer to the Assyrian invasion, since the vision is a picture of the past rather than the future. It seems better, therefore, to take it more literally as meaning *drought*, especially since this is one of the most common calamities in the Orient, as Amos himself testifies (iv. 7 f.).[1] — **the great deep,** not the Mediterranean or any other body of water alone, but the vast reservoirs whence the springs and streams of the earth were believed to be fed (Gen. vii. 11; Deut. xxxiii. 13). Amos in his vision saw this emptied or so far exhausted that it ceased

[1] Various other translations for קרא לרב באש אדני יהוה have been suggested, *e.g. the Lord Jehovah called* [Israel] *to strife with fire* (Baur), and *one called that the Lord Jehovah would punish with fire* (Ewald). Hoffmann corrects the text to לָרָב באש or לִרְכֹּב אש (Ps. xviii. 15), while Oort (*T'T*, 1880, 121) prefers the reading אש (י)רכיב.

to supply the earth with moisture. See Wellhausen, *SV*, V. The language is hyperbolical, but not, therefore, necessarily figurative. Compare Keil. — **would have devoured,** lit. *was devouring*, *i.e.* had begun to devour. See *v.* 2. — **the field,** lit. *the portion*, *i.e.* not the land of Israel (Hitzig),[1] but the land in distinction from the sea, as apportioned among, and cultivated by, mankind, with all its products. This had already begun to suffer from drought, perhaps also from fires such as often create great havoc in the East during the dry season (Joel i. 19 f.; Thomson, *LB*, II. 293), when the prophet again interceded, with the same plea and with the same result.

6. **This also shall not be, said the Lord Jehovah:** other visions of the same import with the two preceding might have been added, at least, to the number of the chastisements described in iv. 6–11, but these two are enough to illustrate the mercifulness of Jehovah and prepare the way for the lesson of the third vision.

THE PLUMB-LINE, *vv.* 7–9. — There is a limit to the mercy even of Jehovah.

7. **Thus he showed me:** the subject *Lord* is to be supplied from the following sentence. Compare *vv.* 1, 4.[2] — **by a plumb wall:** a wall that has been found plumb, perpendicular.[3] — **with a plumb-line in his hand,** as if, like an architect, he were testing the wall. This was evidently a symbolical act, but it might have a

[1] The Septuagint adds *κυρίου*. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) leaves חלק untranslated.

[2] Perhaps the subject originally belonged to this sentence, as the Septuagint would seem to indicate.

[3] There is the same reason for translating על *by* in this as in the fifth vision.

variety of meanings. Amos, therefore, represents Jehovah as interpreting it to him.

8. **What seest thou?** a clear and correct idea of the symbol was necessary to an adequate idea of the thing symbolized. — **I will place a plumb-line in the midst of my people Israel:** just as the architect subjects a wall to the test of the plumb-line, so will I subject Israel to the test of justice, and just as the architect orders the destruction of a wall that cannot stand the test when applied, so will I command that my people be destroyed, because they are incurably wicked. See 2 Kings xxi. 13. — **I will not again pass him by,** spare him, *i.e.* Israel, as I have done (Mic. vii. 18), but let justice take its course. What the result will be appears from the next verse.

9. **the high-places,** the places of worship such as Bethel, Gilgal, etc., the *sanctuaries* of the next sentence. — **Isaac:** it has been suggested (Theodoret) that this name, which, Gen. xxi. 6, is interpreted as meaning *one will laugh*, was intended to reflect on the worship of the high places, but the repetition of it in *v.* 16 shows that, like Jacob (*v.* 2), it is simply a synonym of Israel.[1] — **destroyed:** the destruction of the sanctuaries implies the devastation of the country. The means by which this is to be effected is war, for Jehovah says — **I will arise . . . with the sword,** *i.c.* as he says vi. 14, raise up a nation to wield the sword for him. — **the house of Jeroboam,** not as a dynasty, but as the representative of the nationality of Israel. This passage, therefore, is not a prediction of the dethronement of

[1] The Septuagint renders it by the appellative γέλωτος. On the form ישחק see iv. 11.

Zechariah by Shallum (2 Kings xv. 10 f.), but of the national dissolution of which that was the beginning.[1]

b. Their Significance to Amasiah, vv. 10–17. — It was impossible that one so severe as Amos should remain unmolested. When he ventured to threaten the royal family he gave his enemies an opportunity for which they had doubtless long been waiting.

AMASIAH'S INTERFERENCE, *vv.* 10–13. — 10. The attack was led by — **Amasiah, the priest,** *i.e.* probably the high priest, of whom nothing is known except his hostility to the prophet. — **sent to Jeroboam,** probably to Samaria, but not necessarily, since Bethel also was a royal residence (*v.* 13), and the king may then have been there to attend some religious ceremony. — **Amos hath conspired against thee:** Amasiah does not mean to charge Amos with having a secret understanding with others to dethrone the king, but, as the next verse shows, with using language that was calculated to produce such a conspiracy. There were doubtless at that time in Israel restless and discontented spirits enough who could easily have persuaded themselves that such a prophecy was a divine commission and that, in fulfilling it, they would be doing God service. — **in the midst of the house of Israel,** at the very center of the kingdom, where he could do most harm. — **the land is not able to contain:** this is a bit of oriental extravagance that was intended to indicate the zeal and boldness with

[1] If, as seems clear, this third vision really finds its explanation in *v.* 9, it is not necessary to present any other or better reason for rejecting Hoffmann's rendering for עבור; for *I will not add yet a harvest to him, i.e. I will not grant him to gather another harvest,* would naturally imply merely a third curse, *e.g.* blight, upon the crops.

which Amos prosecuted his mission. — **all his words:** they are so many. See iii. 1.

11. **By the sword shall Jeroboam die:** it was the *house of Jeroboam* that Amos threatened with the sword. Amasiah gives the prophecy a more personal character, probably that it may produce a more powerful effect upon the king. — **Israel shall surely go into captivity:** see v. 5, 27; vi. 7.

12. Amasiah seems to have been less anxious for the throne than for his own position. At any rate, after having sent his message to Jeroboam, from which, perhaps, he did not really expect much, he tried the exercise of his own authority upon the prophet. Compare Gunning. — **Seer,** the older (1 Sam. ix. 9) popular designation for a prophet. Its use here was suggested by the visions which Amos had just recited. — **flee thee,** from the danger into which his boldness had brought him. — **the land of Judah,** his own country. — **there eat bread:** the prophets of the time often gained their livelihood by the practice of soothsaying (Mic. iii. 11). Amasiah, mistaking Amos for a prophet of this sort, orders him to earn his bread by serving his own people.

13. **thou shalt no longer prophesy:** see ii. 12. — **a sanctuary of the king,** a shrine established by the first king of Israel (1 Kings xii. 28) and honored with the patronage and protection of his successors. — **a royal residence,** where the king, as a worshiper, sometimes resided (1 Kings xiii. 1). To Amos the fact that Bethel was the religious center of the kingdom of Israel, was a reason why he should, rather than why he should not, prophesy there, since his object was not to please anybody, but to reach the heads of the nation with his warning.

AMOS' ANSWER, *vv.* 14–17. — The prophet turns upon the priest. 14. **I am not a prophet,** by profession. He *was* a prophet in reality, and he so considered himself, as iii. 7 f. implies and the verse following this one distinctly asserts. — **a son of the prophets,** lit. *a son of a prophet*, a member of one of the prophetic guilds that were formed about such men as Samuel (1 Sam. xix. 20), and Elijah (2 Kings ii. 3), and that sometimes produced a real prophet like Elisha (2 Kings iii. 11). — **a shepherd:** see i. 1.[1] — **a tender of sycamores:** the sycamore, once very common in Palestine, is still found in Philistia (1 Kings x. 20). The wood, though durable, is not highly prized (Isa. ix. 9). The fruit, of which there are several crops during the season, has to be pinched or scratched before it will ripen. It was a part of Amos' business thus to treat this fruit, when Jehovah called him to be a prophet. Whether he owned the trees that he tended or was employed by some wealthier person does not appear. Even in the former case he might have been far from rich, since the fruit of the sycamore was hardly worth the trouble of raising it. See Van Lennep, *BL* 145 f.; Thomson, *LB*, III. 113.

15. **Jehovah took me from behind the flock:** Amos, therefore, when he became a prophet, like the apostles of Jesus, left all to obey the call that he had received. — **Jehovah said:** the repetition of the subject emphasizes the divinity of the prophet's mission. — **my people Israel:** there is a note of yearning in the expression. Compare *thy God*, ix. 15.

[1] The statement of the next verse, *Jehovah took me from behind the flock*, requires that בוקר, if it be retained, be thus rendered. The word is, however, probably as Hitzig maintains a mistake for נוקד. See the Septuagint.

16. **And now:** the preceding introduction was well calculated to add to the effectiveness of the prophecy that follows. — **preach,** lit. *drop, i.e.* words (Deut. xxxii. 2). It is not safe to assert that the word is here used in a bad sense. Compare Hoffmann.

17. **Thy wife shall play the harlot,** be treated as a harlot by the victorious enemies of Israel (Zech. xiv. 2). For proof that such outrages were actually practiced by the Assyrians, see *Records of the Past*, III. 51. — **in the city,** her native city, after its capture.[1] — **thy land shall be divided by line,** apportioned to colonists by the conqueror, in accordance with the policy of the Assyrians after Tiglath-pileser III. See 2 Kings xvii. 24. — **thou thyself,** stripped of everything that is held dear. — **an unclean soil,** a foreign soil, polluted by a false religion (Hos. ix. 3). — **Israel shall surely go into captivity:** Amos does not say that Amasiah will go into captivity at the same time with the rest of Israel, but this is the natural inference from the connection. He must, therefore, have expected that the northern kingdom would be overthrown within a comparatively short time from the date of his prediction. Perhaps, in his zeal for justice, he expected it sooner than Jehovah had ordained that it should occur. As a matter of fact, it was about twenty-five years before Tigleth-pileser III. invaded Israel, and about thirty-five before Samaria was finally attacked by Shalmaneser IV.

2. The Fruit of Sin the End of Israel, viii.

It was not Amos, but Amasiah, who was silenced in

[1] This last phrase seems superfluous, but it is better to retain it than to adopt Hoffmann's emendation בָּעִיר תְּוֻנָה.

the encounter just described. The prophet returned to his message to Israel, and added a fourth vision, which not only recalls the fact that mercy has made way for justice, but displays the lamentable significance of this fact.

a. The Basket of Ripe Fruit, vv. 1–3. — 1. **a basket of ripe fruit:** see Jer. xxiv. 1 ff. This symbol has a twofold appropriateness, since there is a likeness in the original between the words for *ripe fruit* and *end* as well as an analogy between the ideas that the words express. Compare vii. 7; Jer. xxiv. 1.

2. **What seest thou, Amos?** see vii. 8. — **My people Israel are ripe for their end:** literally Jehovah says, *The end has come for my people Israel;* but more or less liberty must be taken with the text in order to indicate, as, *e.g.*, the English version does not, that Amos intended a paronomasia. — **I will not again pass them by:** see vii. 8.[1]

3. **the songs of the palace,** the noisy nothings that Amos has already described (vi. 5).[2] — **shall become howls,** for the dead. — **in that day,** the day of Jehovah, v. 18. — **shall they be cast,** lit. *shall one*, not *he, i.e.* Jehovah (Keil), *cast* [*them*], without taking the trouble to bury them. It is the same scene that was described more vividly vi. 9 f., a scene of death and despair; hence it is natural that at the close of this passage also the hopelessness of Israel's condition should be indicated by

[1] Here, again, Hoffmann, having substituted קִיץ for קֵץ, and thus without warrant destroyed the paronomasia, introduces his peculiar interpretation for עִבּוּר. See vii. 8.

[2] The word הֵיכָל, Ass. *ikallu*, also means *temple*, especially that of Jehovah (1 Sam. i. 9), but the context seems to require the translation *palace*. With שִׁרוֹת, instead of שִׁירוֹת (Hoffmann), such a translation would be still more appropriate.

the warning — **Hush!** not, of course, from the mourning survivors in the palaces, but, as in the former case, from those who are engaged in removing the dead.[1]

b. The Bitter End of Israel, 4–14. — The brief interpretation of this fourth vision in *v.* 3 is now followed by a fuller development of the thought involved, in which there are frequent reminiscences of the second part of the book. He begins with

A NEW INDICTMENT, *vv.* 4–8. — 4. **Hear this:** see iii. 1; iv. 1; v. 1. — **pant after the needy,** eagerly persecute them, to what end is explained in the words following. — **and to destroy the humble:** the whole might be rendered, *who pant to destroy* (lit. *cause to cease*) *the needy and humble.* See ii. 7.[2]

5. **the new-moon,** the first of the month (Num. x. 10), which had been a holiday among the Hebrews as well as their neighbors from the earliest times (1 Sam. xx. 5; 2 Kings iv. 23). It was an unwelcome day to the greedy merchants of Israel because it now and then temporarily checked the increase of their wealth. They would, therefore, doubtless have neglected it had its observance not been enforced by some such sanction as protected the Sabbath from violation. — **the Sabbath:** this also was far from being a delight to them, yet they, at least outwardly, observed it, imagining, perhaps, that

[1] If הֵם is to be retained in the text, this is a far better interpretation of it than that which makes it an adverb (Baur), or that which connects it with the following sentence (Siegfried & Stade). On the other hand, if it is to be rejected, a better explanation of its origin should be discovered than that it is a corruption of הָשׁ, an abbreviation for הָשלך, which some reader preferred to השליך (Gunning).

[2] Hoffmann's emendation וּלְשַׁבִּית for וְלַשְׁבִּית, *i.e.* לְהַשְׁבִּית (Ges. 53, 3, R 7) totally ignores the context. For עֲנִיִּי *humble*, the punctators would read עָנְיֵי *humbled, afflicted,* but the original text seems preferable.

the scanty respect that they paid it would offset their neglect of the weightier matters of the law. — **open corn,** expose it for sale. — **diminishing the ephah,** using scant measures. The size of the ephah has been variously estimated. According to Josephus (Ant. viii. 2, 9) it was equal to an Attic metretes, containing about 39.39 *liters* (40.62 quarts), while according to Thenius, whose calculations are based upon rabbinical data, it contained only 20.12 *liters* (21.26 quarts). See Riehm, *HBA*, art. *Maasse;* compare Smith, *BD*, art. *Weights and Measures.* The practice here described was condemned by all good Hebrews (Deut. xxv. 13 ff.; Prov. xx. 10).[1] — **enlarging the shekel:** a shekel was originally a weight. A shekel of gold or silver was, therefore, a certain quantity of one of these metals, weighed by the buyer to the seller in exchange for any commodity purchased (1 Kings xxxii. 9). It is probable that by an enlarged shekel Amos here means an exorbitant price. The exact value of a shekel is not known, but it has been estimated that the gold shekel weighed about 16.37 grams, and was worth about $10.80, while the silver shekel weighed about 14.55 grams, and had a value of about $.60. See Riehm, *HBA*; compare Smith, *BD*, art. *Weights and Measures.* — **providing false balances,** lit. *perverting balances of deceit, i.e.* tampering with the balances so that they deceive in weight. The balances are those used in weighing the price of the grain sold. Amos, therefore, charges these dealers in grain with selling scant measure for an exorbitant price, weighed in balances adjusted to their advantage, — a threefold crime.

[1] להקטין is a complementary or circumstantial infinitive equivalent to a Latin gerundive. See Ges.[25] 114, 2, R 4.

6. The natural result of such rascality was to make the rich rapidly richer and the poor just as rapidly poorer. The poorest soon had to buy the little that they needed on credit, and thus put themselves into the power of their creditors, who could at any time buy them of the judges before whom they were arraigned, for a trifling bribe. See ii. 6. Moreover, and this is the climax of the indictment, dearly as they paid for it, those who had to buy grain got little satisfaction from it, for it was only — **the refuse of the corn,** that part, but little better than chaff, which consisted mostly of the lighter kernels, tailings.[1]

7. The recital of these iniquitous practices fills Amos with indignation. — **by the glory of Jacob,** not the false (Orelli), as in vi. 8, but the true glory of the chosen people, Jehovah himself. See iv. 2; vi. 8. — **all their deeds,** their many wicked deeds (iii. 1).

8. **on this account,** not on account of the oath of Jehovah (Keil), but because of the corrupt condition of the nation. This is the occasion of the convulsion threatened, though of course the efficient cause is Jehovah himself, as appears from ix. 5. See iii. 6. — **tremble,** be convulsed, as by an earthquake, the most terrible phenomenon in which Jehovah can manifest his indignation. — **like the Nile,** during the annual inundation.[2]

[1] Hoffmann's interpretation of these last words, *and for a share in grain to be sold, we may sell, viz.*, the lowly and needy, is consistent with his explanation of those preceding (see ii. 6), and that is the most that can be said for it. Oort (*TT*, 1880, 155) declares them unintelligible; Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) says that they are at least misplaced.

[2] כְּאֹר is doubtless an error for כִּיאֹר, which is the reading in ix. 5. It is also found in many codices in this passage. יאֹר is the Egyptian word *aur, river*, corrupted into *iar* (Ebers, *Egypten und die Bücher Mosis*, 337), which occurs in Assyrian in the form *jaru'u* (Schrader, *KAT* 151 f.).

— **and heave,** lit. *be driven,* as water is driven, troubled, by the wind (Isa. lvii. 20). The words are an interpolation, as is proven by the fact that they are wanting in ix. 5, and that the earliest translators found nothing to correspond to them in this passage.[1] — **fall like the Nile,** when its waters subside after the inundation.[2]

DISTRESS AND DARKNESS, *vv.* 9–10. — It is the day of Jehovah. 9. **I will cause the sun to set at noon,** suddenly and unexpectedly bring darkness upon the land (v. 18). The picture was doubtless suggested by an eclipse, according to J. D. Michaelis that of Feb. 9, 784 B.C., but it is not to be understood too literally. It is probable that Amos expected a figurative darkness accompanied by corresponding tokens of Jehovah's anger in nature.

10. **I will turn . . . all your songs into lamentation:** see *v.* 3. — **sackcloth,** a token of mourning, worn sometimes under (2 Kings vi. 30), sometimes over, other clothing (Ps. xxx. 12), and sometimes as one's only covering (Isa. iii. 24). — **baldness,** produced, not by plucking at the hair, though the Hebrews sometimes expressed their grief in this way (Ezr. ix. 3), but by shaving the head (Mic. i. 16), a practice forbidden in the Pentateuch (Lev. xxi. 5; Deut. xiv. 1). — **I will make it,** lit. *place it, i.e.* the land and its people (compare Keil) in the condition of one who mourns[3] — **for**

[1] See the Septuagint. If ונגרשה can be explained as a gloss, there is no need of suspecting any further corruption of the text. Compare Wellhausen, Hoffmann, and Vollers.

[2] ונשקה is a mistake for ונשקעה, the reading of many codices.

[3] After *lamentation, sackcloth,* and *baldness,* all tokens of grief, it is perfectly natural that the intensity of this grief should be described as like that for *an only* child; yet Gunning, with Oort, pronounces 10 *b* "an unintelligible half-verse."

an only child, the bitterest imaginable distress. See Zech. xii. 10.[1] — **the end thereof as a bitter day:** there is nothing but distress in store for Israel.

APOSTATE, ABANDONED, *vv.* 11–14. — 11. In their distress some, at least, will feel neither — **hunger for bread nor thirst for water,** although they will have to suffer from both of these causes, so great will be the need of — **the word of Jehovah,** comforting and directing them through his servants the prophets (Isa. viii. 19).[2]

12. **from sea to sea,** not from ocean to ocean (Keil), nor from the sea of Tiberias to the Mediterranean (Henry), but from the Dead Sea, the southern limit of the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings xiv. 25), to the Mediterranean, its western boundary (Joel ii. 20). — **from the north to the east,** thus making the entire circuit of the country (Ps. lxxii. 8). Compare Keil. — **shall they wander:** see iv. 8.[3] — **they shall not find it,** because they themselves have silenced or banished all their prophets. See ii. 12; vii. 13.

13. **the fairest maidens and the youths,** or *the fairest maidens and youths,* the strongest to endure privation among the people. — **for thirst:** they will die of thirst

[1] The reference to Tammuz, the Assyrian Adonis, and his worship, that has been supposed to be discoverable in this passage, is a pure fiction. Compare Smith, *Chaldean Account of Genesis,* 248.

[2] The text has דברי יהוה, but this is certainly a mistake, for דבר יהוה is the proper expression for a communication from Jehovah (see *v.* 12), and this reading is actually found in some of the best manuscripts. Moreover, the Septuagint has *τὸν λόγον* and not *τοὺς λόγους.*

[3] The Masoretic punctuation is evidently incorrect. *They shall stray from sea to sea* and *From the north to the east shall they wander* form a parallelism; ישוטטו, therefore, should close the first, instead of beginning the second, half of the verse. See the Septuagint.

or from some other physical cause because their hunger and thirst for Jehovah's word cannot be satisfied, *i.e.* because they cannot find a prophet to tell them how to escape the evils that their sins have brought upon them.

14. **who swear by,** and thus declare their devotion to (Deut. x. 20). — **the sin of Samaria,** not any idol at the city of Samaria (Hitzig), but the calf at Bethel in the kingdom of Samaria, *i.e.* Israel. See Hos. viii. 5; x. 5.[1] — **By thy god, O Dan,** the calf at Dan (1 Kings xii. 29), now Tell el-Kadi, at the head of the main branch of the Jordan. See Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, 464; Thomson, *LB*, II. 457.[2] — **By the way of Beersheba:** most modern commentators take the word *way* literally, assuming that, as the Mohammedans swear by their pilgrimage to Mecca,[3] so the Hebrews actually swore by the way to Beersheba (Orelli). This interpretation, however, finds no support either here or elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures. It seems necessary, therefore, either to suppose a corruption in the text (Gunning) or return to the earlier view, that by the way of Beersheba is meant the worship at that sanctuary, a view in support of which such passages as Jud. ii. 22 and Jer. x. 2 can be quoted.[4] — **they shall fall,** and the rest of the nation with them. — **and not rise again:** see v. 2.

[1] The phrase אשמת שמרון is not a mistake for אשרת שמרון (Oort), but Amos' equivalent for Hosea's חטאת ישראל (x. 8).

[2] חַי is the profane form for which חַי, the original word, is used with the name of the true God (1 Sam. xx. 3). Compare אדנָי and אֲדֹנָי, and מֶלֶךְ and מֹלֶךְ, נָד and נַד, etc.

[3] "By the pilgrimage and the height of Mina,
Where the pious host stone Satan."
— Rückert's *Hariri*, I. 189.

[4] The attempts to find a satisfactory substitute for דרך have been vari-

3. The Destroyer of Sinners the Hope of his Saints, ix.

The foregoing visions make it clear that a catastrophe is approaching, and that it will be disastrous to Israel. There is only one more question, — Is it inevitable? It is this question that is answered by the fifth and last vision and the discourse suggested by it. The vision is one of —

a. A Smitten Sanctuary, vv. 1–6, under whose crumbling walls most of those who have taken refuge in it are buried, while the rest are destroyed as they escape from the ruins. — 1. **by the altar,** not necessarily either that at Jerusalem (Keil), or one of those at Bethel (Gunning), but *the altar* as a refuge. — **he said:** it is useless to inquire to whom the command is given, the prophet (Baur), or an angel (Hitzig), or some other person. The agent of destruction, in this as in several other cases (iv. 2; vi. 11; viii. 3), is indefinite, and — **Smite the capital,** equivalent to *Let the capital be smitten.* The capital is that of any or every column in the temple to which the altar belongs (Zeph. ii. 14). — **the threshold,** *i.e.* the foundation. See Wellhausen, *SV,* V. — **quake,** from the effect of the blow.[1] — **break them,** the parts of the temple.[2] — **all of them,** those assembled in and about

ous. Thus Dozy reads אלך (*ὁ θεός σου*) on the authority of the Septuagint; Gunning on the same authority אדניך; while Oort suggests ברך (*thy well*), Hoffmann דרך (*thy darling*), etc. None of these suggestions, however, has met with much favor among scholars.

[1] Delitzsch (Isa. vi. 4) renders סִפִּים *lintel,* and the suffix of בצעם at first sight would seem to require such a rendering; but this suffix may, and probably does, refer to the temple as a whole, composed of parts, only two of which, top and bottom, are expressly mentioned.

[2] On בצעם (Baer) for בִּצְעֵם see Ges. 61, 2. Wellhausen (*SV,* V.) is content with pronouncing the text corrupt.

the temple, symbolizing Israel. — **the last of them,** those who do not perish in the ruins. Compare Gunning. — **I will slay with the sword,** as they attempt to escape, so that — **there shall not a fugitive of them flee,** to a place of safety. If one should seem to have eluded the sword, let him not imagine himself beyond the reach of Jehovah. Did not he who escaped from both the lion and the bear at last die of the serpent's bite (v. 19)? This is the thought of which the next three verses are a pitiless development. Compare Ps. cxxxix. 7–12.

2. **sheol,** the cavernous underworld, elsewhere represented as the abode of the dead (Isa. xiv. 9 ff.). It is here the utmost depth as contrasted with the heavens, the utmost height (Isa. vii. 11).

3. **the top of Carmel,** in the caves, said to be two thousand in number, and among the dense foliage, of the summit of the mountain (Mic. v. 14), where Strabo says that pirates found hiding in his day. See Oliphant, *Haifa,* 27. — **there will I seek and thence will I fetch them,** lit. *thence will I seek and fetch them.* — **at the bottom of the sea,** beneath the waters of the Mediterranean. — **the serpent,** one of the monsters that were supposed by the ancients to inhabit the deep (Gen. i. 21; Isa. xxvii. 1).

4. **go into captivity,** as some of them will (v. 27). — **I will fix my eye upon them for evil:** to fix one's eye or face upon a person is to adopt a purpose good or bad with reference to that person (Jer. xxiv. 6; xliv. 11). Jehovah declares that he is bent upon the destruction of Israel. How natural, after such a statement, is the description of Jehovah's power that follows! See iv. 13.[1]

[1] On the genuineness of *vv.* 5 f. see Introductory Studies III.

5. **the Lord Jehovah of hosts,** a name for God not elsewhere used by Amos, is an abbreviation of *the Lord Jehovah God of hosts* (iii. 13). — **toucheth the earth and it quaketh:** in viii. 8 the earthquake is a local manifestation of Jehovah's anger; here it is a more general display of his power. Compare Ps. xlvi. 7. — **riseth . . . and falleth:** compare viii. 8.

6. **in the heavens,** on the mass of waters above the firmament (Ps. civ. 3; Gen. i. 7). — **his chambers,** his dwelling (Jer. xxii. 13).[1] — **his vault,** the starry dome by which the earth is overhung. See Isa. lxvi. 1. — **who calleth:** see v. 8.

b. A Forfeited Distinction, vv. 7–10. — At this point it seems to have occurred to the prophet that perhaps his auditors were saying in their hearts that Jehovah would not so ruthlessly destroy a people which he had rescued from slavery and given their heritage in Canaan. Therefore, though he has himself twice (ii. 10; iii. 1) referred to these great tokens of Jehovah's favor, he now takes pains to deny that they furnish a warrant for presuming upon his mercy.

7. **the children of Cush:** the Cushites of Amos' day were a people who had migrated from Asia, occupied the region now called Nubia, with Napata as their capital, and, under a dynasty founded by an Egyptian priest, added Upper Egypt with Thebes to their territory. Indeed, at about the date of this book, the Cushite or Ethiopian king Piankhi invaded and, if his own account of the matter is correct, temporarily conquered the rest of Egypt. See Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, II. 234 ff. The Cushites are cited, not because they were

[1] The מ of מעלותו is best explained as a case of dittography.

Hamites (Baur), or because they were black (Keil), but because, being outside of the circle of civilized nations known to the Hebrews, they were popularly regarded as least favored by Jehovah of all peoples.[1] — **If I brought Israel up from the land of Egypt, did I not also bring,** etc., lit. *Did I not bring Israel up from the land of Egypt and,* etc. The idea is that, since Israel have not performed their part of the covenant of which they boast, the events of their history in which the hand of Jehovah seemed most evident must be interpreted as manifestations, not of a peculiar interest in them, but of his general activity in human affairs. — **Caphtor:** this region has by some been identified with the island of Crete (Hitzig), by others with the coast of the Egyptian delta (Ebers). It is probable that both regions were peopled by the same tribe and that, after the invasion of Palestine by the Philistines from the southwest (Deut. ii. 23; compare Gen. x. 14), the invaders were reinforced by immigrants from Crete. See Ebers, *EBM* 130 f.; Brugsch, *EP*, II. 401 ff. — **Kir,** the region to which they were afterward transported. See i. 5. This second question is entirely distinct from the first, though intended to suggest the same idea. It is therefore absurd to represent Amos as teaching, contrary to Gen. x., that the Philistines and even the Syrians were Cushites. Compare Hitzig.

8. **the eyes of the Lord Jehovah:** see *v.* 4. — **the sinful kingdom,** Israel. — **only:** the kingdom as a kingdom must fall because the ruling classes are thoroughly corrupt, and, when it falls, all classes must suffer from

[1] On the construction בני כושים for בני כוש (Deut. ix. 2), see Ges. 124, 2.

its overthrow; yet, since there are doubtless those who, though few in number and humble in circumstances, have remained faithful to Jehovah, the prophet is forced to exempt them from utter destruction. He therefore promises them that, as he has already given them reason to hope (v. 15), Jehovah will not utterly destroy — **the house of Jacob:** by the house of Jacob is meant neither Judah (Groetz) nor Israel, in the broader sense (Orelli), as contrasted with Israel in the narrower sense, but, as elsewhere in the book (iii. 13; vi. 3; vii. 2, 5; viii. 7), the northern kingdom in its entirety, as contrasted with the sinful portion of it.

9. **the house of Israel,** good and bad alike. — **among all nations,** as captives. — **in a sieve,** such as is still used by the Arabs under the name *ghirbal* in cleaning grain from the dust and dirt of the threshing-floor. See Wetzstein in *ZDPV*, XIV. 1 ff. — **there shall not a kernel fall to the earth:** just as one who is cleaning grain takes care that, while the dust and dirt fall through the sieve, all the good grain remains in it, so Jehovah, however severely he may chastise the nation as a nation, will see that none of his saints is suffered to perish. See Gen. xviii. 25.[1]

10. **all the sinners among my people,** explains what was meant by *the sinful kingdom.* — **Evil will not . . . befall us:** see vi. 3.[2]

c. A Purified Remnant, vv. 11–15. — For the few who are saved Amos has the most comforting of promises. He assures them that they shall be rescued from

[1] Hoffmann renders צרר *pebble*, and interprets it as a symbol of the sinners, who remain in captivity while the righteous escape. Compare Wellhausen, *SV*, V.

[2] For תגיש and תקדים Wellhausen reads תִּגַּשׁ and תְּקַדֵּם. For בעדינו read בעדנו. Hoffmann suggests עדינו.

captivity, and as subjects of a reunited Hebrew kingdom thenceforth enjoy the fullness of Jehovah's favor.

11. **In that day,** after the execution of the sentence against the apostate kingdom. — **the . . . hut of David:** the once stately *house of David* (2 Sam. vii. 11, 16), the kingdom of David, which was reduced to a mere *hut* by the rupture under Rehoboam and almost completely wrecked through the foolhardiness of Uzziah's father, Amasiah (2 Kings xiv. 8 ff.). It is this hut or booth in a vineyard (Isa. i. 8) to which Amos promises restoration and prosperity. See Hos. i. 11; iii. 5. As he develops this idea he neglects the figure under which he first presented it. — **their breaches,** the breaches by which the cities of the land as a whole have been rendered defenseless.[1] — **his ruins,** *viz.* those of David, or, more strictly, his kingdom.[2] — **rebuild it:** here the prophet returns to the figure with which he started. The fallen *hut* is to be rebuilt, not, however, as a *hut*, but as a *house* worthy of David.[3] — **as . . . of old,** in the days of David and Solomon.

[1] This is a more natural explanation of the suffix of פרציהן than that which refers it to a noun גדרות implied in גדרתי (Delitzsch), or that which finds in it a reference to the two kingdoms into which the original one was divided (Keil). Amos did not expect the *breaches* in the kingdom of Israel to be mended. Hoffmann gets rid of the difficulty at this point by pointing the preceding words סכת דויד הנפלת. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) reads פרציה.

[2] The suffix of הרסתיו has also been referred to בית implied in סכה (Delitzsch) and Israel (Ewald), but as in the case of פרציהן, the former of these interpretations is unnatural, and the latter contradictory of Amos' explicit utterances concerning the northern kingdom. Wellhausen (*SV*, V.) reads חרסריה.

[3] To refer the suffix of בניתיה to a הארץ implied (Hoffmann), or to Jerusalem (Ewald), introduces unnecessary confusion into the sentence.

12. **the remnant of Edom,** all that is left of the nation after its conquest. It had revolted against Joram (2 Kings viii. 22), but it had been partially reconquered by Amasiah (2 Kings xiv. 7). Amos promises that it shall be wholly restored to the house of David. See Ob. 18 ff.[1] Nor is this all; the kingdom is to be restored to its original dimensions, says Jehovah, by the reconquest of — **all the nations over which my name has been proclaimed,** all the nations that were ever subdued by Jehovah through his servants, the Hebrew kings (2 Sam. xii. 28); not only Edom, but Moab, Ammon, Syria, and Philistia, thus extending their dominion from the Euphrates to the river of Egypt (1 Kings iv. 21). Compare Keil.

13. **the plowman shall overtake the reaper:** the growth of that which is sown will be so prompt and rapid under the blessing of Jehovah, that, before the husbandman has fairly gotten his various crops, early and late, into the ground, it will be necessary for him to begin the harvest. Compare Lev. xxvi. 5. In good seasons something like this state of things is said to take place in Palestine at the present day. See Thomson, *LB*, II. 549 f. — **he who treadeth grapes him who soweth seed:** the vintage begins in September, the seed-time for early crops, as soon as the rains, which commence in October, have sufficiently moistened the ground to make plowing possible. An abundant vintage, therefore, would keep the husbandman busy with it until the time to sow had come. See Thomson, *LB*

[1] The translators of the Septuagint, mistaking אדום for אדם and ירש for ירדש, gave to this passage a broader meaning than Amos intended, and made it possible for James (Acts xv. 16 f.) to find in it a warrant for admitting the Gentiles to the Christian church.

550 f. — **the mountains,** on whose slopes the vineyards are planted. — **shall drop must,** produce rivers of wine. See Joel iv. 18.

14. **I will restore my captive people:** it is a mistake to suppose that Amos intended to represent the restoration, whatever may be the meaning of the term, as following the blessing upon the soil (Keil). *Vv.* 11–13 describe the kingdom of David as a *country.* With *v.* 14 begins a description of the lot of Israel as belonging to its *people.* The restoration here meant, therefore, may be, and doubtless is, a restoration from the captivity that the book throughout threatens. — **Israel,** the purified remnant of the northern kingdom, for it is not clear that Amos expected that Judah also would first have to suffer captivity. — **they shall rebuild:** compare v. 11.

15. **they shall not again be uprooted,** always provided they continue faithful to their God. — **I have given them,** and they have now for a time forfeited through disobedience (Ex. xv. 17; Deut. xvi. 20). — **Jehovah, thy God:** the change from the third to the second person produces the effect of a direct personal assurance from the Almighty that the promise given through his prophet shall surely be fulfilled.

SUPPLEMENTARY STUDIES.

I.

AMOS AND THE HEXATEUCH.

The student of the prophecies of Amos finds repeated occasion to refer to the first six books of the Old Testament. The prophet, *e.g.*, mentions historical events, the details concerning which are found only or chiefly in the Hexateuch. His attitude toward certain practices which he describes as prevalent in Israel recalls the legislation commonly ascribed to Moses. He refers to customs and institutions concerning whose origin and significance one naturally turns to the same source for information. Finally, he sometimes uses language similar to that of the Hexateuch. What may one legitimately infer from these facts? that Amos was actually acquainted with the whole or any part of the Pentateuch? that the author or authors of the Pentateuch were influenced by the prophet? or that both parties wrote independently of each other, and that, therefore, the coincidences above noticed are purely accidental? A more detailed statement of the facts above alleged may help to a solution of this question.

The events described in the Pentateuch to which Amos makes more or less distinct allusion are compara-

tively numerous, covering almost the entire period from the Flood to the occupation of Canaan.

He was acquainted with the ethnic traditions preserved in the earlier chapters of Genesis. It has often been asserted that there is no reference in v. 8 and ix. 6 to the Noachian deluge, but the words of the prophets so naturally recall that event, that a reference to it, especially in view of the connection, can hardly be excluded. His statement with reference to the origin of the Philistines apparently conflicts with that in Gen. x. 14, but since it agrees with that of Deut. ii. 23 and Jer. xlvii. 4, the discrepancy is not considered a serious one. The easiest way to remove it is to suppose that, as many maintain, the text of Gen. x. 14 is corrupt, and that it originally read, *the Kasluhites and the Kaphtorites whence went forth the Philistines.*[1] Finally, Amos cites (iv. 11) the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah with especial reference, not so much to the fact of their destruction as to the completeness of it, as if he had read Gen. xix. 25, where the narrator says: *He* (Jehovah) *overthrew those cities, and all the Plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities and that which sprang from the ground.*

Amos was also familiar with the origin of the Hebrews as it is recorded in Genesis. He knew that the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel were really branches of a single family, *the whole family* that came up out of Egypt (iii. 1). He does not trace their descent so far back as Abraham, but he calls the northern kingdom

[1] The reference to *the children of Cush*, ix. 7, is not to be considered in this connection, since it is the Cushites of his own day, and not those of the Ethnic Table of Genesis, who are intended.

the house of Isaac (vii. 16) and *the house of Jacob* (iii. 13). Knowing also that Ephraim was the son of Joseph, he uses the term *the house of Joseph* (v. 6) in the same signification. He even reminds his readers of the relation between Jacob and Esau by calling the Hebrew the brother of the Edomite (i. 11). See Num. xx. 14.

The prophet displays a knowledge of the events connected with the birth of the Hebrew nation in several passages. There are probably two references to the sojourn in Egypt, besides those to the Exodus. The first of these is found in the statement, *I sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt* (iv. 10), which is most naturally interpreted as referring to the plagues with which Jehovah afflicted the Egyptians because they would not let the Hebrews go. See Ex. ix. 3, 15. The last plague with which, according to Ex. xii. 29, the Egyptians were smitten was, perhaps, in the mind of the prophet also where he represents Jehovah as saying, *I will pass through thy midst* (v. 17), for this is the way in which the plague is announced (Ex. xii. 12). The Exodus is mentioned no fewer than three times (ii. 10; iii. 1; ix. 7), and always as an event of transcendent importance. The last of the passages cited (ix. 7) seems to contradict the other two, but the contradiction is only apparent. To Amos, as to the author of Exodus, the escape from Egypt marked the beginning of a new era for the Hebrews, and deserved to be held in lasting and grateful remembrance. See Ex. xiii. 3.

Amos does not mention Moses or Sinai, but he does refer (ii. 4) to a law and precepts which Judah had not observed.[1] In the same connection he adds a state-

[1] On the genuineness of this passage see Introductory Studies III.

ment which reminds one of the golden calf made by Aaron while Moses was in the mountain with Jehovah (Ex. xxxii. 1 ff.), *viz. the lies* (idols) *after which their fathers went have led them also astray.* The subsequent wanderings of the Hebrews in the desert are more particularly noticed. The prophet twice (ii. 10; v. 25) reminds his readers that they lasted in all forty years, just as the Hexateuch constantly asserts (Num. xxxii. 13). In the former of these two passages (ii. 10) the goal of the Hebrews when they left Egypt is given. They were bound for the land of the Amorites, a people whom Amos describes (ii. 9) as extraordinarily tall and strong, like the giants who are said to have terrified most of the spies and all of their brethren on the border of Canaan (Num. xiii. 31 ff.). With the help of Jehovah these Amorites were destroyed and their country occupied by the conquerors (Am. ii. 9). See Josh. x.–xi.

The above quotations from his book show that Amos had somewhere obtained a knowledge of the principal facts of early Hebrew history. What was the source of his information? It is no longer admissible to suppose that he was entirely dependent on tradition. The Hebrews certainly had a literature long before the date of the prophet; for they were not the least cultured of all the nations of Western Asia; and, not to speak of Egypt and Assyria, where the art of writing had been known from time immemorial, even in Moab there was sufficient knowledge of letters at least seventy-five years earlier to permit its king to record his victory over Israel on the monument known as the Moabite Stone. If, now, the Hebrews had any books, there

must have been among them one or more accounts of the great deeds that they believed Jehovah to have done for them. The Jahvistic (J) and Elohistic (E) documents, portions of which have been preserved in the Hexateuch, were just such works. From them, and from them alone, so far as can now be ascertained, the prophet could have obtained all the historical data with which he betrays an acquaintance. The documents J and E must, therefore, as critics generally agree in asserting, have existed in some form when the book of Amos was written.

An acquaintance with J and E, or a compilation from them, which may be designated as J E, explains several other passages in Amos' prophecies. These are his apparent references to the moral precepts which originally belonged to J or E and therefore now from a part of the combined work J E. The influence of this collection of precepts is discoverable, first, in the tone which the prophet adopts toward Israel. He does not attempt to show them that the practices which he condemns are wrong, but he mentions these practices only to condemn them, as one would naturally do whose hearers or readers were familiar with some authority on the subject. Then, too, the principal practices, not, as in the case of the heathen, individual transgressions, which he condemns, are such as J E distinctly prohibits. Thus, for example, he dwells upon the cruelty of the upper classes in Israel toward the lowly and needy (ii. 7; iv. 1; viii. 4), as if he were applying Ex. xxii. 21 ff. or xxiii. 9. He also condemns them for giving and taking bribes and otherwise perverting justice (ii. 6; v. 7, 10 ff.; vi. 12), as Ex. xxiii. 6 ff. would give

him the right to do. Perhaps the most evident reference of this sort is that found ii. 8, where the heartless voluptuaries of Israel are described as stretching *themselves on garments taken in pledge beside every altar.* The garments here meant were without doubt the outer garments of poor debtors that had been taken for debt and not returned at nightfall, as they should have been according to the provisions of Ex. xxii. 26 f.

There are two passages belonging to this group that seem to indicate an acquaintance with another collection of precepts confessedly ancient. The first of them is the charge of unchastity in ii. 7. This sin is, it is true, forbidden by the seventh commandment, and one form of it receives attention in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxii. 16), but the language used by Amos reminds one of the Law of Holiness (H = Lev. xvii.–xxvi.), the oldest portion of the Priestly Document (P), but especially of Lev. xx. 3; see also xviii. 21; xix. 12; xx. 3; xxi. 6; xxii. 2, 32. In the same code, if it then existed, Amos could have found (Lev. xix. 35 f.) authority for condemning as severely as he does (viii. 5 f.) the dishonesty of the merchants of Israel. There is no corresponding passage in J E. On ii. 4 see below.

Thus far nothing has been said about references to religious institutions and observances in the book of Amos. They are, in fact, numerous and important. From him we learn that there were several sanctuaries at which, contrary to the will of Jehovah, Israel worshiped; one at Bethel (iii. 14; iv. 4; v. 5), another at Dan (viii. 14), and still another at Gilgal (iv. 4; v. 5), within the limits of the kingdom, besides that at Beersheba in Judah, to which pilgrimages were sometimes

made (v. 5; viii. 14). At these sanctuaries there were altars (ii. 8; iii. 14; ix. 1) with horns (iii. 14). Perhaps the bowls from which the revelers of vi. 6 drank their wine were such as were used in sprinkling the blood of victims offered upon the altars. The altars were served by priests, one of whom, Amasiah, seems to have had the oversight of matters of religion at Bethel (vii. 10). Tithes were presented by worshipers (iv. 4), and there was at least one annual feast (iv. 4; v. 21), besides the new-moons and sabbaths (viii. 5). The sacrifices were of various kinds, burnt-offerings, vegetable-offerings, peace-offerings (v. 22), thank-offerings, and freewill-offerings (iv. 5), and seemingly very numerous. Finally, iv. 5 implies that nothing leavened was ever burned on the altar.

The above citations indicate that in Israel, and, since, according to 1 Kings xii. 25 ff., the cultus of the northern kingdom was modeled after that of Judah, among the Hebrews as a people, there existed before the middle of the eighth century B.C. what deserves the name of a system of religious institutions and observances. If this system be compared with that of which J E describes the origin, it will be found that the latter makes the impression of being simpler and earlier than the former. See Ex. xxiii. 10–19, but especially Ex. xxxiv. 11–26. The citations in question cannot, therefore, be used to invalidate the conclusion already reached that J E is older than Amos. On the other hand, even the Law of Holiness, in its present form, contains so many details about which Amos says nothing, that he can hardly be regarded as a witness to the existence of P in his day. Moreover, his attitude toward the ceremonialists of the

time indicates that, if P existed, it existed as a separate work, inferior in authority to J E.

It remains to notice any coincidences between the language of Amos and that of the Hexateuch. The phrase *to profane my holy name* (ii. 7) has already been quoted. It is a phrase characteristic of H, but it is the only one so clearly borrowed from the priests. The only other passage that deserves mention is ix. 13, where Amos, in describing the future fertility of the land of Canaan, uses a modified form of a proverbial expression, which occurs also Lev. xxvi. 5. These two passages, taken in connection with viii. 5 f., quoted above, suggest some modification of the conclusion with reference to P, just stated, but they can at most only strengthen the probability, based on *a priori* considerations, of the acquaintance of Amos with some form of H.[1]

The verbal coincidences between Amos and Deuteronomy (D) are more numerous, and, at first sight, seemingly more important. Amos ii. 4 f. is generally regarded as decidedly Deuteronomic. Hence some who, on other grounds, assign D to a later period, feel forced to reject the passage cited as an interpolation. The Deuteronomic character of Amos' words, however, as has already been remarked (Introductory Studies III.), is not unquestionable. It is true that the nouns *law* and *statutes* and the verb *keep*,[2] which are rarer in other parts of the Hexateuch, are among the most frequent words in the vocabulary of D, but there is only

[1] Dillmann (*Numeri, Deuteronomium u. Josua*, 667) quotes the phrase *great deep* (Am. vii. 4; Gen. vii. 11) as indicating an acquaintance with P as a whole, but he does not lay any stress upon it.

[2] תורה, חקים, שמר.

one passage (xvii. 19) which closely resembles Am. ii. 4, and that is not perfectly parallel, while the verb translated *contemn*,[1] though it is found in J E (Num. xi. 20), and is used three times in Lev. xxvi. (H), does not occur at all in D. The word *destroy*[2] is another favorite both of Amos (five times) and D (twenty-nine times), but the nearest parallel to the first passage in which the prophet uses it (ii. 9) is Josh. xxiv. 8, in E's account of the conquest of the Amorites beyond the Jordan. Am. ix. 8, on the other hand, has the same form of expression as Deut. vi. 15. In Am. ii. 10 the statement, *I led you in the desert forty years*, differs only in the arrangement of the words from Deut. xxix. 4, but the infinitive *to possess*, which is very frequent in D, is there used by the prophet in a construction peculiar to him. There are three pairs of words that have sometimes been regarded as indicating the dependence of Amos on D, *viz. oppress* and *crush*[3] (Am. iv. 1; Deut. xxviii. 33), *blight* and *decay*[4] (Am. iv. 9; Deut. xxviii. 22), and *gall* and *wormwood*[5] (Am. vi. 12; Deut. xxix. 17). The last is the only one of the three so used as to give any ground for such a suggestion, and in its case there is as much reason for asserting the dependence of D upon Amos as the contrary. On Am. iv. 1 see 1 Sam. xii. 3, and on iv. 9, Hag. ii. 17. Am. vi. 13, where Israel are represented as boasting: *Have we not in our strength taken to ourselves horns*, recalls Deut. xxxiii. 17. This latter passage, however, belongs to an excerpt from some work considerably older than D, with which Amos may well have been acquainted. On ix. 15 see Ex. xx. 12.

[1] מאס. [2] שמד. [3] עשק, רצץ. [4] ירקון, שדפון. [5] לענה, ראש.

It is plain that there are, after all, very few points of resemblance in language between Amos and D. If now these be explained as the result of dependence of the former upon the latter, it will be difficult to understand why the prophet was not more deeply influenced. That D, if he was acquainted with it, did not produce the effect upon him that might have been expected no one can deny. The tone of his prophecies is entirely different from that of the last words of Moses. He demands justice and righteousness; they command love and charity. Other points of diversity might be mentioned, as for example, Amos' silence with reference to the centralization of worship, on which D is so explicit; but this alone seems sufficient to outweigh any linguistic similarity that can be discovered, and forces upon one the conclusion that if D existed when he wrote, it was unknown to the prophet.

II.

THE THEOLOGY OF AMOS.

Amos was a special messenger of Jehovah. It was his duty to declare his divine Master's attitude toward, and purpose concerning, Israel in view of their actual condition in the reign of Jeroboam II. His book is a record of his mission. Therefore, though full of grand truths grandly expressed, it is anything but a system of doctrine. The most that can be said is that it contains the materials of a more or less complete theology.

It is desirable for several reasons that these materials be put into scientific form and order. It will thus, *e.g.*, become even clearer than the prophet himself has made it what he meant to teach, and it will become possible to compare his teachings with those of the other sacred authors, especially the prophets. These are the ends sought in the following statement of what Amos taught expressly or by implication about God, man, and their mutual relations.

First, then, How did Amos represent God?

The name by which the prophet most frequently refers to the Deity is *Jehovah* (Yahweh). This he uses in every variety of expression and construction, and no fewer than fifty-two times.[1] The word *God*,[2] on the other hand, occurs but once alone as a proper name (iv. 11), and then in a phrase which is probably either a proverb or a quotation (see Isa. xiii. 19). Once, and only once, at the very end of the book (ix. 15), it is used as an appellative in the tender and suggestive expression so frequent in Deuteronomy, *Jehovah thy God*. A third name, *Lord*,[3] is found alone three times in the visions of Part III. (vii. 7, 8; ix. 1). It is much more frequently prefixed to *Jehovah*.[4] In this construction it occurs nineteen times,[5] eleven times in the last three chapters, but nowhere in the book does it seem to add any emphasis to *Jehovah*, or *Jehovah* to increase

[1] i. 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15; ii. 1, 3, 4 bis, 6, 11, 16; iii. 1, 6, 10, 12, 15; iv. 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11; v. 4, 6, 8, 17, 18 bis, 20; vi. 10, 11; vii. 3 bis, 6, 8, 15 bis, 17; viii. 2, 7, 11, 12; ix. 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15.

[2] אלהים. [3] אדני. [4] אדני יהוה.

[5] i. 8; iii. 7, 8, 11; iv. 2, 5; v. 3; vi. 8; vii. 1, 2, 4 bis, 5, 6; viii. 1, 3, 9, 11; ix. 8.

its force.[1] There are longer combinations, however, that are evidently intended to be emphatic. The most common is *Jehovah God of hosts*,[2] which is used six times,[3] but *Lord Jehovah of hosts*[4] (ix. 5), and even *Lord Jehovah, God of hosts*[5] (iii. 13), and *Jehovah, God of hosts, the Lord*[6] (v. 16), also occur. Such titles are calculated to add solemnity to a passage in which the character of Jehovah is described (iv. 13) or his purpose announced (vi. 8).

Amos habitually uses the name by which he had been taught that God had revealed himself to the Hebrews, but to him Jehovah was more than a local or national deity. This is apparent as soon as one begins to notice the attributes which he ascribes to him.

The power of Jehovah according to Amos is almighty. There is a hint of it at the very beginning of the book (i. 2), where, even at the sound of Jehovah's voice, nature is represented as manifesting terror. It is also suggested by v. 9 and vi. 12 f., and by the name *Jehovah, God of hosts* wherever it occurs. These passages, however, are very indefinite compared with others. There are several in which Amos attempts a description of the power of Jehovah. It was displayed in the creation of the world, for Jehovah *formed the mountains and created the wind* (iv. 13). The heavens also are his work. It was he who reared their blue vault and *fixed*

[1] Compare iii. 8 with i. 2; v. 3 with i. 3; iv. 5 with ii. 11; iv. 2 with viii. 7 and vii. 1 with vii. 7.

[2] יהוה אלהי צבאות or יהוה אלהי הצבאות.

[3] iv. 13; v. 14, 15, 27; vi. 8, 14.

[4] אדני יהוה הצבאות.

[5] אדני יהוה אלהי הצבאות.

[6] יהוה אלהי צבאות אדני.

it over the earth (ix. 6), and he made Orion and the Pleiades and all the rest of the gems with which it is adorned (v. 8). It is clear that Amos believed, what the Septuagint in the last passage quoted makes him say, that the God of the Hebrews made *all things*.

Jehovah's power is manifest also in the various phases and processes of nature. He turns darkness to light and light to darkness as often as day and night interchange (v. 8). It is especially apparent in the control which he exercises over nature to the advantage or disadvantage of man. If he so wills, the earth produces with such abundance that the husbandman is overwhelmed by its fruitfulness (ix. 13). If, on the other hand, he refuses his blessing, nature refuses to respond to the efforts of man, and transforms itself into a terrible enemy. Then follows famine throughout the land (iv. 6), or drought such that the inhabitants wander from place to place for water unsatisfied (iv. 7 f.). Sometimes blight and decay destroy the grain, or locusts devour the vineyards and the fig and olive orchards (iv. 9), or pestilence carries man and beast to destruction (iv. 10). Nor is this the worst; for Jehovah can and does make the earth rock, and as in the day when Sodom and Gomorrah were overthrown, utterly devour those who dwell on it (iv. 11). Indeed, Amos refers everything that befalls man, good or evil, to Jehovah. *If evil befall a city, is it not Jehovah who hath wrought it?*

Finally, Amos finds evidence of Jehovah's power in the conduct of history. It was he who brought the Hebrews out of bondage in Egypt (ii. 10) and gave them the land of the Amorites for their possession

(ii. 9). He also presided over the migrations of the Philistines and the Syrians, bringing the former from Caphtor, and the latter from Kir (ix. 7). He holds all the nations in his hand, and when he will uses one of them to destroy another. He declares that he will send the Assyrians against Israel, as well as their neighbors, and give them the lordship over his people *from the entrance to Hamath unto the stream of the Arabah* (vi. 14).

Jehovah is not only almighty, he is everywhere equally powerful. This doctrine is implied in several of the passages already cited. It would, for example, be unnatural to suppose that he who made the world could be confined to any part of it. On the other hand, it is natural to infer that he who governs the world and controls the movements of its inhabitants must in some sense be present in all parts of it. This doctrine is distinctly taught in the remarkable passage explanatory of the fifth vision (ix. 2–4), in which Jehovah is represented as declaring that no place is so deep or high as to be beyond his power; that whether his enemies hide themselves in the wild thickets of Carmel or the dark caverns of the Mediterranean, his hand can still reach them, and that, even when they have been driven into captivity by their enemies, he will follow and destroy them. The prophet could hardly have said more distinctly that Jehovah was omnipresent as well as omnipotent.

There is but an easy step from this point to monotheism, and Amos seems to have taken it. One cannot well explain a number of passages in his book on any other supposition. It is remarkable, *e.g.*, that in his

arraignment and condemnation of the nations in Israel's vicinity (i.–ii.), each of which had a religion of its own, their so-called gods are entirely ignored. So, also, in ix. 7. This last passage amounts to a denial of the existence of other deities than Jehovah. The Philistines and the Syrians certainly did not need them. If more positive evidence on the point in question is wanted, it can be found in the terms in which the prophet refers to idols. Sakkuth is a mere image of wood or stone, the work of human hands, that must be carried about from place to place by those who worship it (v. 26). Nay, it and all the rest of its kind are *lies*, symbols for purely imaginary divinities, by which men are tempted to their own destruction (ii. 4). The inference is that Jehovah, and Jehovah alone, is God.

The moral attributes of Jehovah are not less clearly depicted by Amos than those already noticed. Indeed, the prophet dwells on the irresistible, inescapable power of God only for the sake of enforcing demands growing out of his character. The attribute of justice or righteousness is especially prominent. All those places in which Jehovah is represented as condemning injustice or unrighteousness might be cited in this connection. The first words addressed to Israel are very significant. Jehovah condemns them *because they sell for money the guiltless and the needy for a pair of shoes*, etc. (ii. 6 ff.). These charges are often repeated. The Egyptians and the Philistines are summoned to Samaria to *see the manifold uproar therein and oppression in her midst* (iii. 9). The *kine of Bashan, in the mountain of Samaria*, are described as oppressing the lowly and crushing the needy (iv. 1). The nobles, generally, *trample upon the*

lowly and take a present of grain from him (v. 11); they are *persecutors of the guiltless, and the needy they thrust aside in the gate* (v. 12). Indeed, such is the state of things that one cannot hope for justice, for these wicked nobles *turn justice to wormwood and cast righteousness to the ground.* Another form of iniquity is dishonesty in trade of the most outrageous character (viii. 4 ff.). The most aggravated form of unrighteousness seems to be described in the complaint, *They hate in the gate one who reproveth, and one who speaketh uprightly they abhor* (v. 10), and the case summed up in the assertion, *they know not how to do right* (iii. 10). This unsparing inquisition and uncompromising condemnation of the unrighteousness of Israel leave no doubt with reference to the character of Jehovah. The conviction that *judgment and righteousness are the foundation of his throne* is only deepened by the exhortations to which the prophet now and then gives utterance. *Seek good and not evil* (v. 14), he pleads. *Hate evil and love good, and establish judgment in the gate!* (v. 15). *Let justice roll as water, and righteousness like a living stream!* Finally, the justice of Jehovah is illustrated by the care with which he promises to preserve the innocent when those who have offended him are destroyed (ix. 15). There is no book in the Old Testament in which the righteousness of Israel's God is more strongly emphasized than it is in that of Amos.

One cannot deny that the character of Jehovah, as drawn by Amos, is stern in its outlines. It is not, however, without its tender features, — features which appear the more tender because parts of the same whole with sterner lineaments. The tenderness of

Jehovah manifests itself especially in pity for the unfortunate and longsuffering toward those who disregard his will.

Jehovah is pitiful; otherwise he would not so severely as he does condemn the Syrians and others for the opposite quality. Damascus is doomed because its people *threshed Gilead with ironshod sledges* (i. 3); Gaza, because the Philistines *led* the Jews *completely captive to deliver* them *to Edom* (i. 6); Edom, because *he pursued his brother with the sword, stifling his pity while his wrath ever rent and his fury he nursed without ceasing* (i. 11); and the children of Ammon, because *they disemboweled the pregnant women of Gilead for the sake of enlarging their border* (i. 13). The most touching evidence of the tenderness of the heart of Jehovah, however, is found in the lament (v. 2) in which he bewails the fate of Israel when it seems too late to save them:

Fallen, not to rise again,
Is virgin Israel;
She is hurled upon her soil,
With none to raise her up!

and the exhortations (v. 4 ff., 14 f., 24) by which he still tries to save them from destruction.

Jehovah is longsuffering; of this fact there is proof on every page of the book of Amos. As one reads the indictment against Israel one wonders that they were allowed to add sin to sin so long as they were. When they strayed from him he warned them instead of destroying them, *for the Lord Jehovah doeth naught except he have revealed his purpose to his servants the prophets* (iii. 7); and though they despised reproof and

attempted to silence his messengers (ii. 12), he did not forsake them, but sent, one after another, his chastisements, to bring them back to their allegiance (iv. 6 ff.). It was only when they refused to heed the direst calamities that mercy gave place to justice. This is the meaning of the series of visions with which the seventh chapter begins. First the locusts and then the fire threatens to devastate the land, but at the intercession of the prophet it is spared. Finally the plumb-line is dropped in the midst of Israel, and their doom as a people is sealed.

The total effect of Amos' representation of Jehovah is to inspire awe and submission. These sentiments find expression in the predicate holy. Holiness, according to the prophets, is not strictly an attribute of Jehovah, for they mean by it not a moral quality of the divine nature, but a manifestation of his majesty. Amos twice uses the term holiness in this sense. He declares, for instance, that the licentiousness of Israel is a profanation of Jehovah's holy name (ii. 7), *i.e.* as appears from Isa. i. 4 and iii. 8, his glorious name, or his divine majesty. The threat to destroy the female voluptuaries of Samaria is confirmed by an oath *by his holiness, i.e.* by himself (iv. 2 ; compare vi. 8).[1]

The Almighty, Maker and Ruler of all things, perfect in righteousness, and equally wonderful in his tenderness toward his creatures, — such, according to Amos, is Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews. Of man, as man, there is not so complete a picture.

[1] On this general subject see Baudissin, *Studien* II. 78 ff.; Schultz, *Alt testamentliche Theologie*, 554 ff.; Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*, 169 ff.; W. Robertson Smith, *PI*, 224 f.

The first characteristic of man, as described by the prophet, to attract attention, is his weakness, as compared with his creator. The gigantic Amorites were no match for Jehovah when he led his people out of Egypt (ii. 9). *The stoutest of heart among the mighty* in Israel cannot hope to resist him (ii. 16). He can reach and destroy them even behind their strongest defenses (v. 9), or he can take and scatter them among the nations as one tosses grain in a sieve (ix. 9). The most forcible passage bearing upon this point is iv. 12 f., the gist of which is that it is simply madness for man to contend with God. See also vi. 12 f.

A second question respects the moral condition of man by nature. On this point the general tone of Amos' book might lead one to expect to find him teaching something like the innate depravity of the race. This, however, is not the case; for, though he condemns the nations one after another, he always treats their sins, not as the fruit of an evil principle, but as ugly excrescences on human nature. In other words, he teaches that man by nature is neither good nor bad, but simply endowed with a capacity for moral character.

In accordance with this general doctrine Amos represents even the heathen as possessed of a knowledge of the difference between right and wrong. He probably regarded it, like the notion of cause and effect (iii. 3 ff.), as a natural endowment, which, in the case of the Hebrews, had been supplemented by special revelation. He does not deny the universality of this faculty when he declares that Israel *know not how to do right* (iii. 10). He would not hold them responsible for not having anything that they had not received. What he means

is that having been endowed with the ability to distinguish between right and wrong they have ceased to exercise it, and thus reduced themselves to a condition in Jehovah's sight inferior to that of the Philistines and Egyptians who are summoned to act as their judges (iii. 9). Hence the severity of the sentence pronounced against them.

A second endowment, which is everywhere in the book of Amos taken for granted, is moral freedom. This is implied in every accusation brought and every sentence pronounced. It is most clearly taught in the charge that Israel, young and old, indulge in uncleanness, *for the sake of profaning*, that is, although they know that in so doing they profane, the holy name of their God (ii. 7). It is prominent, also, in the refrain in which the failure of Jehovah to restore Israel to their allegiance is lamented (iv. 6 ff.); for there would be no reproach in the statement, *Yet ye returned not unto me*, if Jehovah himself were responsible for the result. Finally, the exhortations which Amos addresses to Israel become mockery unless freedom to yield to them be presupposed. In this connection it is interesting to notice that according to Amos the freedom of the will may survive when the capacity for moral distinctions has practically perished; for those *who know not how to do right* are the very persons whom he exhorts to *hate evil and love good*, that they may live (v. 10, 15).

It remains to consider God and man as the prophet pictures them in their relation to each other.

It is plain that the normal relation between Jehovah and his creatures must be one of limitless beneficence on the one side and reverent obedience on the other.

Jehovah is good to all men. This universal beneficence is displayed in his care for their interests. Thus, for example, according to the prophet, he directed the migrations of the Philistines and the Egyptians as well as those of the Hebrews (ix. 7). Upon the Hebrews, however, he has bestowed especial blessings (iii. 2), rescuing them from slavery, granting them the land of Canaan as a possession (ii. 9 f.), and making them among the most prosperous of peoples (vi. 2). The prophet does not give any reason for the favor shown the Hebrews, but he could doubtless have explained it without reflecting upon the justice of Jehovah to other peoples. Had not they, and they alone, however imperfectly they afterward served him, formally recognized in him the true God?

The duty of man to God, as above indicated, is reverent obedience. In the case of the nations who have received no further revelation of his will, this means a faithful observance of what Paul calls *the law written in their hearts* (Rom. ii. 15). It forbids cruelty, for example. When, therefore, they show mercy to the weak or wretched, they thus, even if they do not know him by this name, honor Jehovah. The case of the Hebrews, according to Amos, does not differ from that of other peoples so much as might be imagined. They know that Jehovah is God, hence they are forbidden to serve other so-called deities, but the service which he requires of them is of the same sort as that which he receives of those to whom he is an unknown God. He has no pleasure in offerings and sacrifices in themselves considered (iv. 4 f.; v. 21 ff.); and, strange as it may seem, he does not prescribe any state of mind or

heart toward him or one's fellows as necessary that one may secure his favor. It is good, not God or man, that Israel are exhorted to love (v. 15). Amos, therefore, might have stated the whole duty of Israel as Micah afterward stated it, when he said (vi. 8): *What doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justice and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God?*

The actual relation between God and man, as described by Amos, is one of almost universal alienation. The heathen within the prophet's horizon have repeatedly violated the plainest dictates of humanity (i.–ii.). Judah *have contemned the law of Jehovah and have not observed his statutes* (ii. 4). As for Israel, they have exactly reversed the command of their God, and learned to love, not good, but evil, while *they hate in the gate one who reproveth, and one who speaketh uprightly they abhor* (v. 10). This is a dark picture, but it is not so dark as it at first sight appears; for the prophet, sweeping as are his denunciations, does not teach that the estrangement between God and man is literally universal, or that it is absolutely impossible for the worst of apostates to return to Jehovah. He knows, indeed, that there are still some good kernels in the seemingly worthless mass of Israel (ix. 9), and he hopes to add to their number almost to the last. What, now, is the effect upon Jehovah of the disobedience of his creatures? Amos answers without hesitation. It has forced him to use his power to the injury rather than for the benefit of mankind; for to the prophet the secret of all the ills to which men are exposed is sin. Not that suffering is, properly speaking, the effect of transgression. His idea is that when men sin, Jehovah, after warning

them through his prophets, at first afflicts them for the purpose of bringing them back to him (iv. 6 ff.), but that if they do not respond to his chastisements he employs the same means for their destruction. There are certain passages from which one would conclude that men are chastised or destroyed by communities and not as individuals, so that sometimes the innocent have to suffer with the guilty. Toward the end of his book, however, Amos is careful to vindicate the justice of Jehovah by explaining that it is the sinners among Israel who are doomed to destruction (ix. 10). Those who remain faithful to him are assured that he will not permit them to perish (ix. 9).

Amos has nothing to say with reference to the fate of sinners beyond the visitation with which he threatens them. It was not necessary that he should express himself on the subject. Those who were destined to be preserved, on the other hand, had a right to expect something respecting their future, and he does not disappoint them. The prospect which he reveals to them, however, is purely temporal; for all that he promises them is the return of the golden age of Hebrew history. Judah and Israel are to be reunited under the house of David and the remnant of the neighboring nations reconquered in the name of Jehovah. Then, so abundantly will the land be blessed, *the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and he who treadeth grapes him who soweth seed, and the mountains shall drop must, and all the hills flow therewith* (ix. 13). And then? Amos makes no reply. Would the value of his prophecies to those to whom they were addressed have been greatly enhanced if he had answered this question?

III.

AMOS AMONG THE PROPHETS.

Amos belonged to a succession of prophets, all of whom acknowledged the same authority and pursued the same general object. It is therefore natural to expect to find points of contact between him and those who followed, as well as those, if there are any whose works have survived, who preceded him; and one who has made his book a study will also expect to find that he influenced later prophets more than he was influenced by possible predecessors.

At the outset it is necessary to settle the question, whether any of the prophetical books preserved in the Hebrew canon antedate that of Amos. It has always been held that Joel and Obadiah lived and wrote before Amos, and this opinion still has able defenders;[1] but, of late, many have felt forced to assign the first two to a much later period, and thus leave the last at the head of the list of prophets.[2] The subject has already received passing attention, and a preference for the latter view has been acknowledged (p. 54). The reasons given for believing Joel earlier than Amos are the following: The relative position of the two books in the canon indicates that this was the opinion of the compilers of the collection to which they belong. The

[1] See Credner, *Der Prophet Joel;* Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments;* W. J. Beecher, *The Historical Situation in Joel, Amos, and Obadiah,* in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1888.

[2] See Merx, *Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger;* Farrar, *The Minor Prophets;* Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament;* G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets.*

phrase *I will not revoke it*, so often repeated by Amos, leads one to expect references to an earlier work; and the parallels between his book and that of Joel are explained as instances of such dependence. A third argument is based on a study of the historical background of Joel. Amos describes the Philistines, the Phœnicians, and the Edomites as concerned in an invasion of Palestine that seems to have been that in the reign of Joram (2 Kings viii. 22; 2 Chron. xxi. 16). These, with the Egyptians, who made a similar invasion in the reign of Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 25), the early enemies of the Hebrews, are the nations that Joel threatens with the vengeance of Jehovah. Hence, — and his silence with reference to the Assyrians and the Babylonians is supposed to point in the same direction, — it is concluded that he preceded Amos, having probably delivered his message in the early part of the reign of Joash. This position, however, cannot be maintained. The reasons given for it are not so strong as they were once regarded; since it has become clear, that the order of the books in the canon furnishes an insecure basis for argument concerning their dates, and that parallel passages may sometimes be used on either side in a controversy. The conclusion above drawn from historical references, also, is unsound; because it ignores data of great significance, especially the evidence that, when the book was written, Judah and Israel were convertible terms (ii. 1, 27; iv. 1 f., 16), and that these names denote the dependent community of the period of the Restoration (i. 2; iv. 1 f.). Furthermore, the author of the book evidently shared the ideas characteristic of the later prophetic writers. Under this head are to be noted, the

neglect of moral considerations (ii. 17 f., 32; iv. 16, 20), the apocalyptic character of the representation of the day of Jehovah (ii. 2, 10, 30 f.; iv. 9 ff.), and the prominence given to fasting as a means of securing the divine favor (i. 14; ii. 15). Joel, therefore, instead of preceding, must have followed Amos, and that after an interval of perhaps three centuries.

The relative age of the two books having been determined, a further comparison of their contents might be postponed until the writings of the earlier successors of Amos had been examined. The points of contact between them, however, are so few, that they may as well be cited before the subject is dismissed. In fact there is only one in which the influence of Amos is clearly visible, the one between Joel iv. 16 and Am. i. 2, to which attention has already been directed. It should further be observed, that, whereas to Amos the roar of Jehovah from Zion augurs evil to the Hebrews, as well as their lawless neighbors, to Joel it means a world-wide convulsion in which *Jehovah will be a refuge to his people, and a stronghold to the children of Israel.* If Am. ix. 13 is genuine, Joel iv. 18 is another example of the same sort; for in this case, also, Joel enlarges upon the thought of his predecessor.

The book of Obadiah probably belongs to the same period with that of Joel; but there is no evidence that its author was influenced by Amos, unless it be in the similarity between Ob. 10 ff. and Am. i. 11.

The first of the prophets, whose date is undisputed, to follow Amos is Hosea. That Hosea was acquainted with the prophecies of his predecessor, appears from iv. 15, v. 8, and x. 5, 8, where he adopts the changed

name that Amos gave to Bethel (v. 5), and from viii. 14, where he quotes, almost *verbatim*, Am. ii. 5. Less striking is the resemblance of Hos. iv. 1 to Am. iii. 1, etc.; Hos. iv. 3 to Am. viii. 8 and ix. 5; Hos. vii. 10 to Am. iv. 6; Hos. ix. 3 to Am. vii. 17; Hos. xii. 7 to Am. viii. 5; and Hos. xii. 10 to Am. ii. 10. This, at first sight, seems to have been the extent of the influence of Amos upon Hosea. Indeed, so strong is the contrast between the two prophets as they appear in their books, that one is tempted to doubt the reality of any, even the most superficial relation. Thus, *e.g.*, Amos emphasizes Jehovah's holiness; Hosea, his love. Moreover, while Amos, in his denunciations, deals only with concrete sins, Hosea condemns Israel for a disloyal *attitude* toward their God. It is, however, to be noticed that the difference between them does not affect the essential doctrines in their prophecies. They are agreed that Israel's condition is one of alienation from Jehovah (Hos. i. 2), that, therefore, the nation as a nation must perish (Hos. i. 4; ix. 3, 17), and that the only hope of such as are spared is in Judah and the house of David (Hos. i. 7; iii. 5). So thorough agreement, especially in view of the fact that Hosea was himself of the northern kingdom, indicates that this prophet was powerfully influenced by the shepherd of Tekoa.

Chapters ix.–xi. of Zechariah have been supposed to betray that they were written before the fall of Samaria. If they were, their author would naturally show some acquaintance with the prophesies of Amos. The first verses of ix., especially 4 and 5, seem to betray such an influence. Compare also x. 6 with Am. v. 15 and x. 9 with Am. ix. 9.

Of all the prophets the one most nearly related to Amos is Isaiah. Indeed, although the latter never really quotes the former, the resemblance between the two is so striking that Isaiah may be called a second and grander Amos. The very first words of Isaiah remind one of Amos; for the complaint *I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me*, is but a variation of Am. iii. 2; and there are several other reminiscences of the book of Amos in the same chapter. Compare, *e.g.*, *v.* 4 with Am. ii. 7; *v.* 7 with Am. iv. 11; *v.* 8 with Am. v. 2; *vv.* 11 ff. with Am. v. 21 ff.; *v.* 16 f. with Am. v. 14 f. There are equally interesting parallels with utterances of the earlier prophet in other parts of Isaiah's book. Thus, *e.g.*, the abrupt arraignment of the daughters of Zion (Isa. iii. 16 ff.) was evidently suggested by Am. iv. 1 ff.; the woes of Isa. v. 8 ff. and x. 1 ff. recall those of Am. v. and vi.; the strophes of Isa. v., ix., and x. correspond with those of Am. iv. 6 ff.; and, finally, the oracles of Isa. xv. ff. against the neighbors of the Hebrews seem modeled after those of Am. i. f.

There is no essential difference between the theology of Isaiah and that of Amos. The two prophets agree in representing Jehovah as requiring of his people a merely civil righteousness. Isaiah lays less stress than Amos on the divine mercy and long-suffering, probably because he regarded as final the predictions of the latter, especially respecting the fate of Israel. Isaiah, however, goes far beyond his predecessor in the development of certain of their ideas. Thus, *e.g.*, while Amos merely refers to the holiness, *i.e.* the awe-inspiring majesty of Jehovah, Isaiah makes this the most strik-

ing feature of his representation of the Deity. See especially Isa. vi. and the name, *the Holy One of Israel* (or *Jacob*),[1] which is used interchangeably with *Jehovah* and *the God of Israel* (xxix. 19, 23). The doctrine of the remnant is the best example of the statement above made. This was distinctly stated by Amos and adopted by Isaiah. Moreover, Isaiah clung to it when there seemed absolutely no prospect of its realization. In fact the darker the outlook, the more brightly he painted the future of his people. Finally, the representative of the house of David of his visions became little short of a divine incarnation (ix. 6 f.; xi. 1 ff.), and his realm embraced the earth, restored to Edenic purity and fruitfulness (iv. 2; xi. 6 ff.; xxxii.).[2]

The book of Micah reminds one of both Amos and Isaiah. The style, like that of the book of Amos, is strikingly picturesque. It abounds in comparisons, and these comparisons are of the kind that were to be expected of one born and bred, as were Amos and Micah, in the country. See i. 4, 6, 8, 16; ii. 12; iii. 12; iv. 12; v. 7, 8; vii. 1, 4, 17. The humble origin of the author seems to be indicated also by the fact that like Amos he directs his denunciations especially against the rich and the great. See iii. 1 ff., 9 ff.; vi. 12; vii. 3. In a few passages the language seems to betray the influence of the book of Amos. Compare Mic. i. 3 with Am. iv. 13; Mic. ii. 3 with Am. iii. 1 and v. 13; Mic. iii. 2 with

[1] i. 4; v. 19, 24; x. 17, 20; xii. 6; xvii. 7; xxix. 19, 23; xxx. 11, 12, 15; xxxi. 1.

[2] The above comparison is based on the prophecies generally attributed to Isaiah, *viz.* Isa. i.–xxxiii., except xiii.–xiv. 23 and xxiv.–xxvii. See Driver, *Introduction*. In the remaining portions of Isa. i.–xxxix there are no clear traces of the influence of Amos.

Am. v. 15; Mic. iii. 9 with Am. v. 10; Mic. iii. 11 with Am. viii. 5; and Mic. vi. 15 with Am. v. 11. It will be noticed that nearly all of the coincidences with the book of Amos are found in the first three chapters of that of Micah. The ideas of these chapters also harmonize with those found in Amos' prophecies. The contents of the remaining chapters are evidently the product of a more advanced stage in the progress of revelation; a stage more advanced than even that represented by Isaiah. Micah, for instance, if he is the author of these chapters, like Isaiah, agrees with Amos in condemning as worthless ceremonial observances, but he surpasses both of them in his statement of Jehovah's requirements (vi. 6 ff.). In his doctrine of the remnant, too, are found some new features. Amos and Isaiah distinguish two classes, the sinners and the righteous, condemning the former to destruction, and promising the latter final deliverance (Am. ix. 9; Isa. iii. 10 f.). Micah finds his whole people, in one degree or another, guilty before Jehovah (vii. 2, 9). Those, therefore, to whom he promises a share in Israel's glorious future are such as, having been humbled by chastisement (vii. 9) and forgiven their iniquities (vii. 18), are spared for the sake of the covenant between Jehovah and their fathers (vii. 20). In view of the development in these directions it seems strange that Micah remains behind Isaiah in his conception of the extent of Messiah's Kingdom. True, he quotes, as is generally supposed, the magnificent passage from an unknown prophet (iv. 1 ff.) with which Isaiah attempted to inspire his contemporaries (ii. 2 ff.), but it seems to have had no influence upon his own imagination, since he everywhere

else represents the dominion of the new David as confined to the Promised Land (vii. 14), as Amos does in his prophecies (ix. 12).[1]

The books of Nahum and Habakkuk present no points of contact with the prophecies of Amos.

Zephaniah was a disciple of Isaiah, but there are two or three passages in his book which seem to betray an acquaintance with that of Amos. Compare Zeph i. 13 with Am. v. 11; Zeph. i. 15 with Am. v. 20; Zeph. ii. 4 with Am. i. 7 f.; and Zeph. ii. 8 with Am. i. 13.

The last three chapters of the book of Zechariah, which, by many, are supposed to have been written shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, have still less in common with the book of Amos, but perhaps Zech. xii. 1 may have been suggested by Am. iv. 13, Zech. xii. 10 by Am. viii. 10, and Zech. xiii. 5 by Am. vii. 14.

Jeremiah is more nearly related to Hosea than to Amos. The fact strikes one as one begins his book; for in the second chapter (*v.* 2) he adopts the very figure under which Hosea (ii. 15 f.) represents the relation between Jehovah and the Hebrews, that of wedlock; and he frequently returns to it in his subsequent prophecies. Like Hosea, therefore, he pleads with his people to return to Jehovah, and, like Hosea, he hopes to the last that they will heed his warnings and accept the forgiveness of their God. Jeremiah resembles Hosea also in that much as he differs from Amos in more essential characteristics, he frequently

[1] The above discussion must have suggested doubts as to the genuineness of parts of the book of Micah. The question is one of so great difficulty that critics have not yet been able to reach an agreement concerning it. See Driver, *Introduction;* Cornill, *Einleitung.*

adopts the form or language of the prophecies of the shepherd of Tekoa. In fact, there is none of the prophets who betrays a better acquaintance with Amos than Jeremiah. There are several more or less exact quotations from the book of Amos in that of Jeremiah. Thus Jer. xvii. 27 is clearly based upon Am. ii. 5; xlix. 27 upon Am. i. 4 (see Jer. xxi. 14; l. 32); xxi. 10 upon Am. ix. 4 (see Jer. xxiv. 6; xxxix. 16; xliv. 11); xxv. 30 upon Am. i. 2 (see Joel iv. 16); Jer. xlvi. 6 upon Am. ii. 14; Jer. xlvi. 7 upon Am. viii. 8; and xlviii. 7 and xlix. 3 upon Am. i. 15. In a number of other passages there are probably references to expressions used by Amos. Compare Jer. ii. 10 with Am. vi. 2; Jer. iv. 28 with Am. viii. 8; Jer. v. 12 with Am. ix. 10; Jer. v. 31 with Am. iv. 5; Jer. vi. 6 with Am. iii. 9; Jer. vi. 26 with Am. viii. 10; Jer. ix. 16 with Am. ix. 4; Jer. xiv. 12 with Am. v. 22; Jer. xvii. 16 with Am. vii. 15 and v. 18; Jer. xxi. 12 with Am. v. 6; Jer. xxiv. 6 with Am. ix. 15 (see Jer. xxxi. 40; xxxii. 41); Jer. xxxi. 6 with Am. vi. 1; Jer. xlviii. 45 with Am. ii. 2 and li. 14 with Am. vi. 18 (see Jer. xlix. 13). In this connection mention should be made of certain expressions peculiar to Amos and Jeremiah. One of these is *Virgin Israel*,[1] which is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament. The phrase, *days are coming*,[2] is not used by any of the other prophets. The same is true with one exception (Hos. xii. 6) of *Jehovah, the God of Hosts*.[3] Jeremiah also

[1] בתולת ישראל Am. v. 1; Jer. xviii. 13; xxxi. 4, 21.

[2] ימים באים, Am. iv. 2; viii. 11; ix. 13; Jer. vii. 32; ix. 24; xvi. 14; xix. 6; xxiii. 5, 7; xxx. 3; xxxi. 27, 31, 38; xxxiii. 14; xlviii. 12; xlix. 2; li. 47, 52.

[3] יהוה אלהי (ה)צבאות, Am. v. 15, 16, 27; vi. 8, 14; Jer. v. 14; xv. 16; xxxv. 17; xxxviii. 17.

imitates Amos in the use of the formulas *Jehovah is his* (my) *name*, and *Jehovah of Hosts is his name*,[1] which with a single exception (Ex. xv. 3) occur elsewhere only in deutero-Isaiah.[2] Finally, the influence of Amos may be traced in the descriptions of Jehovah's power with which Jeremiah sometimes seeks to increase the effect of his utterances[3] and the visions which occur in his prophecies.[4] If there is any doctrine in which there is a striking agreement between Jeremiah and Amos, it is that concerning the value of ceremonial observances. On this point, however, Isaiah and Micah are quite as radical as Amos, hence it can hardly be said that such passages as Jer. iii. 16; vi. 20; vii. 21 f.; and xiv. 12 indicate a peculiar relation between the last-named prophet and Jeremiah.

There is little in the book of Ezekiel to show that he was acquainted with the prophecies of Amos. There is, however, one chapter, the twenty-fifth, in which there is evidently an attempt to imitate the strophical arrangement of Amos' arraignment of the nations. Compare also Eze. vi. 8 with Am. ix. 9; Eze. vii. 2, 6 with Am. viii. 2; Eze. xxviii. 18 with Am. i. 10, and Eze. xxxv. 5 with Am. i. 11.

The office of deutero-Isaiah was to comfort and not to condemn. One ought not, therefore, to expect to

[1] The former occurs Am. v. 8; ix. 6; Jer. xvi. 21; xxxiii. 2; the latter is not found in the book of Amos. In its stead *the God of Hosts is his name* appears, v. 27, and *Jehovah the God of Hosts is his name*, iv. 13. It is found in Jeremiah x. 16; xxxi. 34; xxxii. 18; xlvi. 18; xlviii. 15; l. 34; li. 19, 57.

[2] See xlii. 8; xlvii. 4; xlviii. 2; li. 15; liv. 5.

[3] See, *e.g.*, v. 22 ff.; x. 12 f.; xxxi. 35; xxxii. 17 f.; li. 15 f.

[4] See i. 11 f.; 13 ff.; xxiv. 1 ff.

find many points of contact between him and Amos. There is, in fact, but one respect in which there may be said to be a resemblance between them. Both incline to reinforce their prophecies by references to the power and majesty of Jehovah. In the case of deutero-Isaiah, however, it is always promises of deliverance and not threats of destruction, to which these references are attached.[1] The formula *Jehovah of Hosts is his name* already noticed serves a similar purpose. There are few, if any, other coincidences in language. The nearest approach to a quotation is Isa. lxv. 21, which may have been suggested by Am. ix. 14. Isa. xlv. 23 also reminds one of Am. vi. 8; Isa. lviii. 12 and lxi. 14 of Am. ix. 14; and Isa. lxvi. 16 of Am. vii. 4.

The prophet Haggai (ii. 17) quotes Am. iv. 9.

The first eight chapters of the book of Zechariah contain several visions,[2] some of which, like those in the book of Jeremiah, seem imitations of the style of Amos. See iv. 1 ff. and v. 1 ff.

There is nothing in the book of Malachi, unless it be the single passage i. 12 (compare Am. ii. 7), to indicate that its author was influenced by Amos.

The book of Jonah, whose date is uncertain, but is probably post-exilic, contains no references to that of Amos.

The above review and comparison shows that Amos must be regarded as one of the greatest of the prophets, since nearly all of the later ones were more or less influenced by him, and the greatest among them, Isaiah and Jeremiah, were most indebted to his prophecies.

[1] xl. 12 ff.; xlii. 5; xliv. 24; xlv. 7, 12, 18; xlviii. 12 f.; l. 2 f.; li. 13.
[2] i. 8 ff.; ii. 1 ff.; iv. 1 ff.; v. 1 ff., 5 ff.

ADDENDA.

PAGE 24, N. Cheyne, in his introduction to the second edition of W. R. Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, rejects ii. 4 f., and G. A. Smith suspects the genuineness of both this and i. 11 f.; but Driver defends them both (*Joel and Amos*, 117). Other passages rejected by Cheyne are i. 2; iv. 13; v. 8 f., 26; viii. 11 f.; ix. 5 f., 8–15. G. A. Smith questions the genuineness also of iv. 13; v. 8 f., 14 f.; vi. 2; viii. 13; ix. 5 f.; and denies that of ix. 8–15. Driver is as conservative with reference to these passages as in the case of the first mentioned.

PAGES 136 FF. The last seven verses of the fifth chapter still continue to have especial interest for biblical scholars. The following are some of the more recent results of the attention given them: —

In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1894 Torrey suggests, — and the suggestion is adopted by Cheyne in the *Expositor* for January, 1897, — that in *v.* 26 the vowels of the words סכות (*sikkuth*), and כיון (*kiyyun*), were borrowed from שקוץ (*shiḳḳus*), *abomination*, a word which has been substituted for another designation for a false god in 1 Kings xi. 5, and elsewhere in the Old Testament.

Torrey and Cheyne, it will be observed, regard the words in question as proper names. Not so Schmidt in the same volume of the *Journal*. For סכות he reads סכת (*sukkath*), the construct of סכה (*sukkah*), *taber-*

nacle, and כיון he renders *image*. He further, with Wellhausen, omits כוכב (*kokebh*), *star*, and צלמיכם (*ṣal^{e}mekhem*), *your images*, but retains the rest of the verse, giving to the introductory ו a coördinate sense, and obtaining the following result: —

Did ye bring me sacrifices and meal offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?

Did ye then carry about the tabernacle of your king, the image of your god which ye have made for yourselves?

He supposes that Amos here wishes to impress his contemporaries with the uselessness of their processions, as well as their sacrifices, in honor of Jehovah. The interpretation is an interesting one, but it puts a severe strain on the connective.

Francis Brown, in his Hebrew Dictionary, under מנחה (*minḥah*), suggests an emendation for *v.* 22 which is worthy of consideration; but if, as he proposes, עלות (*'oloth*), *burnt offerings*, be omitted as a gloss, it would seem necessary also to drop מנחה (*minḥah*), *vegetable offering*, from *v.* 25, which, however, would then be rather short for the connection.

Page 141. For נקבי (*n^{e}ḳubhe*), *noted*, Torrey proposes to read נקפו (*niḳ^{e}phu*), *go round*, suggested by the rendering of the Septuagint; thus getting, for the whole verse, *Woe to the easy-going in Zion, and the confident in Samaria! Make the round of the foremost nations, and come to them, house of Israel!*

Page 175. Most later critics, as has been indicated, pronounce the last eight verses of the book ungenuine, an attempt to lighten the gloom of the preceding predictions; but Torrey maintains that *vv.* 8–10, except 8 *b* and 9 *bβ* must be attributed to Amos (*JBL*, XV. 153 f.).

The Riverside Press
PRINTED BY H. O. HOUGHTON & CO.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
U. S. A.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 09874 737 9